

THE STORY OF MY LIFE
by
LALA LAJPAT RAI



THE STORY OF MY LIFE

By

LALA LAJPAT RAI

An Unknown Fragment

Edited with an Introduction and Notes

by

Joginder Singh Dhanki

M.A., Ph.D.



GITANJALI PRAKASHAN

New Delhi-110024

Published by
KRISHNA SONDHI
Gitanjali Prakashan
Lajpat Nagar IV
New Delhi-110024

First published in 1960

Cover design by
Three A Corporation

Printed at
Dhawan Printing Works
26-A, Mayapuri
New Delhi-11 0064

*Dedicated to
Lala Lajpat Rai
“The Lion of Punjab”*

Preface

Lala Lajpat Rai wrote *The Story of My Life* in English between August-November 1928. This 80-page typed document covering Lajpat Rai's life from 1912 to 1916, has remained unseen by the compiler of the works* of Lajpat Rai and other scholars. I came across the manuscript recently during my research on life and times of Lajpat Rai. He appears to have recorded his life's story in fragments. He began writing his autobiography in Urdu in 1914 when he was in New York and this covers the period from 1865 to 1907. He continued the thread of his story in English when he was in Lahore in 1928, leaving a gap of five years (1907-12) for no accountable reason. Full of insights into the vicissitudes of India's political struggle during the period it covers, the account is of much value to students of Indian history.

The six chapters of the autobiographical fragment are significant and revealing in many respects. In this autobiography, Lajpat Rai gives an account of his departure as a Congress delegate for England and his work there. The object of the deputation to England was to represent Indian views on the Press Act, the reform of the India Council, the separation of Judicial and Executive functions and the South African question. Lord Crewe, the Secretary of State for India, was expected to introduce a bill in Parliament for reducing the number of the members of the India Council and for increasing the power of the Secretary of State for India. On his arrival in London, Lajpat Rai met Sir William Wedderburn, Sir Henry

* *Autobiographical Writings*;

Cotton, Webbs and other non official Englishmen. He drew their attention to the repressive policy of Indian Government, the unrest in the Punjab and to Lord Crewe's India Office Bill. About the Crewe's Bill, he pleaded for the inclusion of more Indians on the India Council to be elected by the elected members of the Indian Legislative Councils. The Secretary of State, however, rejected his suggestion. It was after the rejection of the Bill that Lajpat Rai demanded the total abolition of the Council. Lajpat Rai observed, "the delegates of Indian National Congress were prepared to accept it as a first instalment of the intended reform though they never concealed their disappointment at the inadequate representation of Independent Indian opinion, and particularly at the proposed method of selection of Indian members". In fact the Bill was rejected on July 7, 1914 mainly on account of the Tory Party's opposition although Lord Morley made a "spirited and strongly worded defence" of the Bill. Lajpat Rai said: "The Tory Party in the House of Lords made short work of it, though they spoilt a great deal of logic in doing so". Thus ended Lajpat Rai's formal official work as the Congress delegate.

Incidentally, Lajpat Rai touches on the Lahore conspiracy case in which Balraj and Balmokand were involved. This is the only autobiography of an Indian leader which delineates the life of these two revolutionaries and their associations with him. Was Lajpat Rai involved in the Lahore conspiracy case? What was his attitude towards these revolutionaries? Was he the source of inspirations to them? Did the Government suspect him of conspiracy? These are some important questions which the hitherto unknown autobiography answers.

Sir William Wedderburn was one of the most important non-official Englishmen whose "advise and help" was "indispensable" to Indian leaders who visited England to promote the India's cause. It is evident from this work that Lajpat Rai and Wedderburn were in close touch through correspondence and personal contact. Wedderburn shared Lajpat Rai's concern for "the state of unrest in Punjab" and agreed with him that "repression aggravates the evil, and that the remedy is to be found in creating an atmosphere of confidence and goodwill." He expressed his sympathy for India in a letter to Lajpat Rai on 27 August, 1914. "I have found", he wrote to

Lajpat Rai, "Prussian bureaucracy more enlightened and more human than the British bureaucracy in India".

While in England Lajpat Rai raised the question of the miserable plight of Indians in Canada. The position of Indians in the Dominions in general and in Canada in particular was one of the burning question in May, June, and July 1914. Canada, with a view to preventing the entry of Indians, had tightened its immigration laws. At this time Baba Gurdit Singh took a "shipload of Hindus" to Canada with the intention of breaking the immigration rules of British Columbia which denied admittance to Indians unless they had travelled to Canada in the same ship directly from India. He had chartered a Japanese ship, *Komagata Maru*, and took about 500 Indians, mostly Sikhs to Canada. They were not allowed to disembark in Vancouver and a strict guard was kept on the ship to prevent landing of the passengers. On reaching England, Lajpat Rai moved the British Government to save the *Komagata Maru*. He met Charles Roberts, Under Secretary of State, and other prominent persons and sought their intervention. Referring to his efforts, Lajpat Rai wrote in the diary: "I interviewed the important editors and also wrote to the press pointing out the dangers of the policy and the impropriety of the Dominion Government's stand." His forceful writings caught the attention of Henry Bourassa, a Canadian Parliamentarian and a great sympathiser, of India's cause. Both leaders met and discussed the question of Indian Immigration to Canada. The Canadian leader threw the whole responsibility of anti-Asiatic policy of the Dominion on the British. In Britain Lajpat Rai persuaded the British Government to exercise its legal as well as moral authority on the Canadian government to allow the *Komagata Maru* passengers to land. Though the *Komagata Maru* had finally to return to the homeland the efforts of Lajpat Rai to champion the cause of Indian settlers abroad has been clearly brought out in the diary.

In the chapter, "The Great War and Indian Loyalty" Lajpat Rai discussed India's "duty" towards the Empire in War time. When the First World War broke out, Lajpat Rai, then in England in 1914 did not share the general attitude of the Indian politicians. The declarations of loyalty was rather embarrassing to him who had been proclaiming from house to

house tops that British rule in India was "unnatural, unjust and unrighteous" and that economically India was "bled white" by the drain. Although he was the last leader of the Congress in England who had signed with other members of the Congress delegation the pledge of loyalty to the Empire he did not believe in the conditional support to the British in the war. He belonged to the section of the Indian politicians who wanted to extend help to the British on a clear understanding that after the War was over, India should be granted self-rule. He published an article in which he blamed the British Government for the simmering unrest in India. He warned that the situation would grow very grave unless the British handled it in a spirit of liberal statesmanship. Though he had assured the British Government and the British people of Indian loyalty to the Empire, he wanted that British statesmen and the British people should not construe this assurance as representing "an absolute condition of the Indian mind". Britain, he warned, must remember that there was an "Indian problem". India, Lajpat Rai stated clearly "is not fighting against German militarism...she is not fighting for the Empire...she is fighting for a just and honourable and equal place in the Empire..." In contrast to Congress declaration he maintained that India should not support England in the War as mercenaries. Unlike other leaders he did not wish to take advantage of England's difficulty during the War. He felt that the freedom struggle after the War might, however, be more bitter and sustained. Even when preparations for what proved to be hopeless 'rising' in India at the instigation of Germany were being made in the U.S.A., Lajpat Rai had the courage to declare that no thoughtful Indian was anxious to or even willing to seek the aid of a foreign Government.

Lajpat Rai wanted to keep off from the Indian revolutionaries abroad. The Indian revolutionaries in America and Japan repeatedly tried to win his sympathy for the Government of Germany. But they failed because his means and methods for the India's political advancement were wholly different from theirs. In this autobiography, Lajpat Rai gives his reasons for keeping himself aloof from Indian revolutionaries. First, he had his doubts about the plan and success of the revolutionaries. He did not believe that an alliance with Germany

would do any good to India. "I therefore", writes Lajpat Rai, "resisted all attempts to involve me into this alliance and simply refused to be a party to any schemes of bringing about a revolution in India with the help of German money or German arms. I knew that outside the ranks of the army there were few Indians who could even wield an ordinary rifle or use even a revolver. What chance was there for the success of a revolution in India, even if [German arms] could be smuggled into India in sufficient quantities for the use of the revolutionaries?" Although, Lajpat Rai was an enemy of the British *Raj* and he had no faith in the "bona fides of British declarations or British promises" but he could not bring himself to believe that "an alliance with Germany was likely to do us any good". Further, he did not want to do or say anything which might jeopardise India's case at the time of peace settlement after the War. He was politically inclined to think that India was not prepared for a revolution. He explained, "Having no faith in the keen readiness of my country for an armed revolution I could only wish them to proceed on the lines and I wanted to continue my work on the same lines". Then a personal reason was also not lacking. Lajpat Rai was anxious to return to India from his long sojourn abroad. If he were to establish any connection with the Indian revolutionaries his return to India would be delayed. However, notwithstanding his disagreement with the Indian revolutionaries as to their aims and methods and his refusal to join their activities, Lajpat Rai kept himself in touch with some of them. He admired their patriotism and spirit of self-sacrifice. He also gave them advice "willingly and freely", mainly, to save them from injury.

He had a very clear understanding of the Indian situation. He saw that Indian revolutionaries were mistaken in believing that India was ripe for an armed revolution. The failure of Gadar movement later confirmed his views. The technique of his national work abroad was not only constitutional but also more effective in furthering the cause of India's independence.

The autobiography is of great historical importance as it throws fresh light on certain events and developments such as the Lahore conspiracy case, *Komagata Maru*, the Indian revolutionaries, attitude of Indian leaders towards the War, the inside working of the British India Committee, the attitude of

non-official Englishmen in Britain towards Indian Nationalism, the problems of Indian students abroad, etc. The autobiography reveals Lajpat Rai's great mental anguish over the radical policy of the British. Lajpat Rai had the vision to see the profound effect of the War on India and Asia. War, he believed, would stir Asia to its greater depths than what Russo-Japanese war did. It is an autobiography written in a clear, bold and eloquent manner and delineates unknown certain aspects of the story of Indian national struggle.

The appendices contain, besides Lajpat Rai's letters published in various newspapers in Britain, a pamphlet entitled *Why India is in Revolt Against British Rule* (London) written in 1916 when he was in New York. This pamphlet is a powerful and passionate indictment of the British rule. Finally, it supports the chapters of his autobiography.

In bringing out this publication we pay an humble tribute to the "Lion of Punjab" on his 50th death anniversary which falls on 17 November 1978.

I am deeply grateful to the staff of the National Archives of India, Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, Library of Indian Council for World Affairs, Gandhi Smarak Sangrahalaya, New Delhi. Dwarka Das Library, Tribune Office Library, Panjab University Library, Chandigarh for providing assistance and facilities to me. I am also thankful to Mrs. H.B. Pease daughter of Col. Wedgwood, Col. H.E.A. Cotton grandson of Sir Henry J.S. Cotton, India Office Library, London, University of Massachusetts Library Amherst, Massachusetts and Congress Office Library, Washington for supplying me valuable material on Lajpat Rai.

In preparation of this work I owe a deep debt of gratitude to Dr. Pardaman Singh, Panjab University, Chandigarh without whose encouragement and help the work would have remained an unfulfilled desire.

I also wish to express my thanks to Dr. S.R. Bakshi for having gone through the manuscript and given suggestions for improvement. My thanks are also due to Shri B.D. Yadav, Research Scholar, for his keen interest and cooperation in the progress of the work.

It is my duty to acknowledge Shri Sevakram, Chairman of the Servants of the People Society who took keen interest for its publication. I am thankful to the Gitanjali Prakashan, New Delhi for publishing the book so nicely.

Joginder Singh Dhanki

Contents

	<i>Pages</i>
PREFACE	I-VII
INTRODUCTION	1-19
CHAPTER 1. With Congress Deputation to England	20-34
(A) Lahore case and Some Revolutionary Friends	
(B) A Congress Delegation	
(C) Indian Council Bill	
(D) More Criticism of the Whig Bill	
(E) Semi-official Defence	
(F) My own views	
CHAPTER 2. The Indian Politicians and Wedderburn	35-37
CHAPTER 3. Indians and Canada	38-47
(A) Komagata Maru Tragedy and Myself	
(B) The Hosts of Asia	
(C) A White Man's World	
(D) The Challenge of Asia	
(E) Barring the Door	
(F) Measures that Fail	
(G) "Making Hay" of the Empire	

THE STORY OF MY LIFE

CHAPTER 4. The Great War and Indian Loyalty	48-62
(A) My attitude towards the War	
(B) Attitude of other Indian leaders	
(C) Articles on the War	
 CHAPTER 5. The Indian Student in England	 63-68
(A) The Indian Office Bureau	
(B) The Root of the Trouble	
(C) The Chimere of "Political Contagion"	
 CHAPTER 6. Myself and the Indian Revolutionaries	 69-74
(A) "Benevolent Neutrality"	
(B) Unwelcome Friends	
(C) Fuss About A Toast	
 APPENDICES	 75-118
	119-120
 INDEX	

Introduction

Lala Lajpat Rai is one of the most illustrious sons of India. He played a very significant role in Indian struggle for freedom. Popularly called as the 'Lion of the Punjab', his life is a permanent inspiration to succeeding generations of India.

Lajpat Rai was born on January 28, 1865 at Dhudike¹ in Ferozpur district of the Punjab. His family was far from affluent; his grandfather, Lala Rala Ram, was a shopkeeper, and his father, Lala Radha Krishan, was an Urdu teacher in a Government School. His devout Muslim Headmaster inculcated love of Islam among his pupils in order to encourage them to embrace the Islamic faith. Though Lajpat Rai's father did not formally declare himself a Muslim, his religious convictions leaned heavily towards Islam. He observed Muslim fasts and deprecated Hindu customs and rituals. He was an ardent follower of Syed Ahmed Khan and his close friends were also Muslims. On the other hand, Lajpat Rai's mother, Gulab Devi, came from an orthodox Sikh family. Lajpat Rai was married to Radha Debi (1877) and he had three sons Pyare Lal, Pyare Kishan, Amrit Rai and one daughter, Parvati.

In Lajpat Rai's early boyhood, his father read to him from *Quran*. He recited *Namaz* and sometimes fasted in *Ramzan* under his father's influence. In 1879, he joined the Mission

¹*Daily Milap* (Lahore), November 17, 1929, p. 4, statement of Dhanpat Rai on the controversy about his brother Lala Lajpat Rai's place of birth; also my interview with Harikrishna Dutta in Hissar who married the niece of Lajpat Rai, in November 1907 at Jagraon.

High School in Ludhiana. From Ludhiana he went to Lahore for further study in November 1880. He passed the Entrance Examination from Government College, Lahore, and in 1882 qualified for *Mukhtarship* (Junior Pleader).²

After completing his studies, he started his legal practice at Lahore in 1886 and later shifted to Hissar to practice as a *Vakil*. Here he also maintained his attachment with Arya Samaj's activities. In that effort, he received support from philanthropists and social workers like Lala Chandulal, Lala Lakhapat Rai and Dr. Ramji Lal. His activities gained momentum. Very soon he was elected member of Hissar Municipal Committee and he also served as its honorary secretary. He was elected unopposed to the Committee from a ward which was predominantly inhabited by the Muslims. In Municipal affairs, he toned up the administration through honesty, intelligence and public spirit and gained popularity and respect. His interest in political affairs began to increase with success as an advocate and he was soon selected as a Hissar delegate to attend the Allahabad Session of the Indian National Congress in 1888.³ When Lajpat Rai arrived at Allahabad session as a Congress delegate from Punjab, he was received with great acclamation. The fifth Congress session, which met at Bombay, in December 1889, was again attended by Lajpat Rai and this afforded him an opportunity of putting forward his views and arguments before the elite of India.

During his attendance of Congress sessions, Lajpat Rai noted that it was an organisation exclusively of the elite, the new western-educated, professional classes. Prayers, petitions and protests were instruments for the political reconstruction of India. He found that the congress leaders cared more for pomp and fame than for the interests of India and the Indians. He fully realized that for giving impetus to the movement, a lot of spade work was to be done among the masses.

Lajpat Rai's growing interest in political affairs convinced him that Hissar was not a proper place for fulfilling his

²*Lala Lajpat Rai : Autobiographical Writings* (Delhi, 1965), p. 110.

³*Report of the Fourth I. N.C.*, Allahabad, 1888, p. 33.

⁴*Report of the Fifth I.N.C.*; Bombay, 1889, p. 25.

ambitions and aspirations. He, therefore, shifted to Lahore in 1894. From 1894 to 1903 Lajpat Rai, generally speaking, did not take much part in active political life. He confined himself to the writing of books, articles, pamphlets for preaching his ideas on social, educational and humanitarian works. From 1894 to 1903, except the Lahore session of 1900, Lajpat Rai did not attend any annual session of the Congress. His ill health, educational, social and humanitarian works and Congress policies kept him aloof from the Congress sessions. Through the columns of *The Punjabee* (Lahore) and *The Tribune* (Lahore), he advocated bold and constructive policy for the Congress and he called upon its leaders to shed off outdated ideas and undertake serious business for political work. He regarded the policy of appealing to the conscience of British rulers as of no avail.

In 1904 at the Bombay session Lala Lajpat Rai and G.K. Gokhale were selected as Congress delegates to visit England for putting before the British people and political leaders the claims of India.⁵ His visit to England, in 1905, was a turning point in his political career and also in the history of the nationalist movement. On his return to India, he was a changed man with a firm conviction that Indian political salvation would depend on the efforts of her own people and on their self-reliance with regard to political work. "You can at time", Lajpat Rai wrote, "successfully appeal to humanity and benevolence of individuals but to hope for justice from a nation is hoping against hope. The role of a foreign democracy is in this respect most dangerous".⁶

It was Lord Curzon who gave an impetus to a new movement of resistance and vehement opposition. The partition of Bengal in 1905, despite strong protests, created a stir throughout the country. The spirit of moderation began to evaporate and there emerged a new leadership particularly in Bengal and Maharashtra. The new nationalist leaders called Extremists at that time rejected the passive policy of the Congress, based on prayers and petitions. In the annual session of the Congress (1905), Lajpat Rai played unique role and he helped in saving the Congress from breaking up. Again, at the

⁵ *Report of the Twentieth I.N.C.*; Bombay, 1904, Resolution IV.

⁶ *The Indian Review*, November 1905, pp. 750-51.

1906 session of the Congress at Calcutta where the Presidential issue, Boycott, *Swadeshism*, National education and self-government on colonial lines were the burning questions, Lajpat Rai made efforts to bridge up the gulf between the Moderates and the Nationalists. As a leader of the Punjab Congress, he did not want his province to meddle into this unnecessary controversy. In an editorial, Lajpat Rai explained the neutral position of the Punjab Congress towards the Congress leaders. He described that controversy "extremely silly", and he held both groups responsible for this development.⁷ He did not relish the extravagant attacks on the "old" leaders, though he regretted that they had failed to change with the times. Sir William Wedderburn, was upset at this situation in the Congress, had urged Lajpat Rai to help the Congress in the hour of its crisis.⁸ Lajpat Rai, however, assured Wedderburn that he would act up to his wishes and would do his best to avert the split.⁹ In the Calcutta session when the conflict on the question of Boycott was about to take worse turn he attempted to solve the controversy by introducing an amendment.¹⁰ Here he acted as peace maker to maintain unity within the Congress. It was at least partly due to his efforts that Congress was saved from an open rupture for another year.

In 1905-06, Punjab had become the scene of hectic political activity. Various unjust administrative and legislative measures like the Colonization Bill, increase of irrigation rates and the abnormal increase of land revenue in Rawalpindi district had created unrest among the peasantry. In this tense situation Sir Denzil Ibbetson, the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab, without understanding the real nature of unrest, in a Minute to the Viceroy described Lajpat Rai, a "dangerous agitator and revolutionary", and he requested the Viceroy to deport him.¹¹ Erle Richards and Sir A. Adamson, Members of the Viceroy's Council were against the policy of deportation. They

⁷Letter, October 4, 1906. Lajpat Rai to Gokhale, *Gokhale Papers*.

⁸Letter, August 3, 1906, William Wedderburn to Lajpat Rai, *ibid*.

⁹Letter, September 11, 1906, Lajpat Rai to William Wedderburn *ibid*.

¹⁰*Lajpat Rai's Autobiographical Writings* p. 114.

¹¹*Home Deptt.; G.O.I. (Poll.)* No. 695, April-May 30, 1907.

preferred to adopt other stringent methods. They also drew his attention that Lajpat Rai "is a member of a society of moderates whose policy is to proceed by constitutional means".¹² But the Viceroy, Lord Minto, trusting the judgement and information of Lt. Governor of Punjab, deported Lajpat Rai to Mandalay without consulting the Secretary of State. Lajpat Rai's friends in the British Parliament pressed the Government to try him in the court of law. His deportation severely criticised by the Indian Press, Congress leaders, Railway employees and meetings were held in several parts of India to protest against the deportation. Soon the Viceroy realised the hollowness of Ibbetson's Minute and being impressed by the great popularity of Lajpat Rai decided to release him after six months of his arrest. His brief imprisonment greatly elevated his stature as a national hero.

During the period Lajpat Rai was in Mandalay, the struggle between the two wings of Congress had taken a new turn. Both the groups were endeavouring to seize the organization and run it on their own lines. By the time of his release, Lajpat Rai had gained enormous popularity, both in public and the Congress, and the Extremists wanted to put his name for the Presidentship of the Indian National Congress. According to the existing convention, the Chairman of the Reception Committee of the previous session was usually voted to the Chair. But the Extremists resented the nomination of Dr. Rash Behari Ghosh owing to his moderate sympathies. There was also rumour that the four militant resolutions of the Calcutta Congress were not to be taken up for consideration. Thirdly, a *Swadeshi* Exhibition was about to be held after the Congress session. There was a proposal to invite an European to open the Exhibition. The Extremists who could not bear the idea of a European opening such an exhibition resented this move. Their stand was that "a *Swadeshi* Exhibition should be opened by a *swadeshi* man".¹³

In the beginning, Lajpat Rai did not comment when his

¹²Letter, February 2, 1907, B.S. Moonje to G.M. Chitnavis, *Chitnavis Papers*.

¹³Letter, February 2, 1907, B.S. Moonje to G.M. Chitnavis, *ibid*.

name was first mentioned for Presidentship of the Congress. He did not even give reply to his supporters' letters.¹⁴ When the Moderates changed the venue of the Congress from Nagpur to Surat, the Extremists approached Lajpat Rai to preside over a separate Congress at Nagpur. But Lajpat Rai did not want any split within the Congress. He opposed their proposal of holding a separate Congress. He replied that Punjab sentiment was firmly opposed to the idea.¹⁵ On November 3, Lajpat Rai broke his silence and explored the controversy on the presidential issue. He decided to keep himself aloof from the Congress controversy. He requested all his friends "to desist from mentioning my name in connection therewith", and he appealed to them to accept the nomination of the Reception Committee in a spirit of loyalty and love".¹⁶ He wanted peace within the Congress. So he assured Gokhale that the Committee's action regarding the presidentship had his full support. He received a number of letters and telegrams to accept the presidency if "it was formally made" to him. But Lajpat Rai was not ready to consider any such proposal unless he was sure that "it had the unanimous consent not only of the Reception Committee, but of the leaders as well".¹⁷

In such confused situation, Lajpat Rai arrived at Surat on the morning of December 25, 1907. He was keen to bring about unity in the two Congress groups. Apart from the sharp controversy regarding the election of the President, the Extremists also feared that the Moderates intended to tone down the four resolutions passed at the Calcutta Congress viz. *Swadeshi*, *Swarajya*, Boycott, and National Education. He saw, on the day of his arrival, Tilak and Khaparde in the afternoon and intimated to them his intention of arranging a meeting of a few leading delegates from each side to settle the various questions in dispute. They agreed and Lajpat Rai went to see G.K. Gokhale to arrange for the meeting. But Gokhale did not favour Lajpat Rai's idea of a meeting of a few representatives

¹⁴ Letter, November 3, 1907, Lajpat Rai to Gokhale, *Gokhale Papers*.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ Khaparde Diary, December 18, 1937, *Khaparde Papers*.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

of the two camps to sort out the disputed points.¹⁸ In the face of this situation, Lajpat Rai realised that compromise was not possible. He was unhappy and sad. He did not make any further effort. What happened in Surat is a well known story. Lajpat Rai had worked for unity and harmony in the Congress.

After his release from Mandalay the events and developments in the country greatly distressed Lajpat Rai. Divided Congress, repression let loose by the government,¹⁹ emerging fire of communalism all alarmed him and in his almost broken state of health he thought that a short stay outside India would be advantageous. In 1908 he went to England.

In England, Lajpat Rai endeavoured to further the cause of India through his speeches and meetings the prominent members of Parliament. His aim was to seek their support and sympathy for the patriotic cause dear to his heart. During his visit many British politicians had become his friends like Mr. Hart Davies and Parker, Labour M.P.'s for Halifax. He delivered lectures in which he referred to the inadequacies of the Indian administration. He appealed to the Labourites to help the Indian agitation as the success of the later would give a blow to the class of capitalists and landlords. He also drew their attention to the deplorable condition of Indians in South Africa.

Lajpat Rai was the first Congress leader who attended the conference on the defence of Nationalities and Subject Races held at Caxton Hall in June, 1910 under the auspices of the International Committee formed in 1907. In England, he worked for the release of Tilak and other political prisoners. On September 21, 1910, he returned to India. During his stay abroad, he made use of every opportunity to further India's cause.

After his return Lajpat Rai inaugurated his entry into politics by successfully contesting Lahore Municipality election in 1911.²⁰ Next year he attended the Congress session at Bankipore, Patna. Here he supported a resolution condemning the Delhi bomb outrage. He also condemned the terrorists' activities and considered it not only against the tradition of India

¹⁸Attalaye, D.V., *The Life of Lokamanya Tilak* (Poona, 1921).

¹⁹*Home Deptt.; G.O.I.; (Poll.) Deposit*, Nos. 7. November 1908.

²⁰*Home Deptt.; G.O.I. (Poll-B) August 1911*, Nos. 41-44.

but also a great hinderance in political progress of the country.²¹ His unforgettable performance at this session was the fervent advocacy of the cause of Indians in South Africa. In a vigorous speech, he roused the enthusiasm of the audience to a very high pitch. At the next Congress held at Karachi in December 1913, he again spoke on this subject. The delegates greatly applauded his bold and vigorous speech. He also led a campaign in the Punjab for raising funds for the Indian sufferers in South Africa.²²

Lajpat Rai again went to England in 1914 as a member of the Congress delegation although the British authorities tried to prevent his departure first on the ground that he was involved in the Lahore Conspiracy Case and later on the ground of his earlier deportation to Mandalay in 1907. Both the Viceroy and the Secretary of State (Hardinge and Crewe) regarded him as "a dangerous leader and a person who was in touch with the Extremists."²³

Having left his country Lajpat Rai had to pass a number of years (1914-1919) in exile in England, America and Japan. But even in that period of sorrow and suffering, he worked hard to secure the sympathy of foreign people, and he succeeded in creating certain centres of sympathy and moral support for the suffering Indians. He attempted to make Indian issue an international problem. In Japan, Lajpat Rai carried on his nationalistic propaganda through press. It was generally moderate and well worded. His articles were published in various newspapers of Tokyo and Yokohama.²⁴ Among the high officials whom he met were the Premier (Count Okuma), several members of the Cabinet and other politicians.²⁵ Professor Iso Abe and professor Whelnack were his close friends.²⁶ He delivered lectures at the Waseda and Keio Universities and also Higher Commercial School at the invitation of the authorities.²⁷ In November 1915 he presided over a banquet in honour of

²² *Report of the Twenty Seventh I.N.C.*; Bankipore, 1913, pp. 39-40.

²³ Letter, December 14, 1913, Lajpat Rai to Gokhale, *Gokhale Papers*.

²⁴ Letter, March 4, 1914, Hardinge to Crewe, *Hardinge Papers*.

²⁵ *Lajpat Rai's Diary*.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ *Ibid.*

the coronation of the new Emperor of Japan. He also became popular among the Japanese students. They addressed letters to him in which sympathy was expressed for Indians. Lalaji studied at first hand the Japanese institutions and wrote about that marvellous country and its phenomenal success. By his writings in the Japanese press and by lectures and discussions he explained India's case to the people of Japan. He exposed the evils resulting from British imperialism in the country.

During his forced stay in the United States he founded the Indian Home Rule League with its headquarters at New York, and thus provided his propaganda an institutional form, and made it possible for the Americans sympathetic to the Indian cause to work in collaboration with Indian Nationalists. A monthly organ of the league entitled *Young India* was started in January 1918 with Lajpat Rai as its editor. J.T. Sunderland became its General Secretary and Hardikar, the Executive Secretary. Keshav Rao Shastri was its prominent member. From January 1918, Lalaji also began publishing a monthly journal, *Young India*, with N.S. Hardikar as its editor and D.S.V. Rao as General Manager. The League also established an Indian Information Bureau to furnish facts and reliable informations about Indian affairs to editors of periodicals, writers, students and others, and to serve as medium through which books on India might be ordered. During his stay in America, Lajpat Rai actively propagated Home Rule for India. He argued that the splitting up of an independent India into a number of political units was still preferable to its remaining under emasculating British rule. He said that while English political ideas negated the totalitarian philosophy of Heinrich Non-Treitschke, British rule in India acted upon the doctrines of the Prussian Professor. After the War, on August 29, 1919, Lajpat Rai and N.S. Hardikar were allowed to address the Foreign Relation Committee of the Indian Home Rule League.²⁸

In the United States Lajpat Rai employed his time in study, writings and propaganda on behalf of India. In September 1916, he wrote a book entitled *Young India* with the object of drawing the attention of the civilized world to what was happening in India. This book was followed, a year later, by *England's*

²⁸Letter, September 18, 1919, Tilak to Khaparde, *Khaparde Papers*.

Debt to India, which depicted a sordid picture of economic exploitation of the country under British rule. In 1919 was published the *Political Future of India* which contains Lajpat Rai's views on the Montford Reform Scheme and other related problems. In a different class stands his *Problem of National Education* for India, also written during his stay in America. Through his writings in America newspapers like *The Nation*, *The New Republic* and others, he brought to the knowledge of the people of U.S.A. the glorious past of India and mis-rule and exploitation under British Indian Government. With this purpose in view he travelled throughout the length and breadth of the country, visiting New York, Princeton, Boston, California, Washington, Atlanta, New Orleans, Chicago, Urbanica, Los Angeles and San Francisco. Lalaji had a number of friends in America who helped him in his propaganda for the cause of India. The most important among them were Burk Cochrane, Prof. Kenes, Merzer Prof. Seligman, Walter Lippman, B.W. Huebsch, J.T. Sunderland, A.J. Gronna and Noris, Dudley Field Malone, Oswald Garrison Villard, Dr. Doubois etc. Lajpat Rai's pioneering work in U.S.A. was able to win moral support and sympathy of many citizens of America. One can say that by creating a favourable and sympathetic public opinion, he prepared ground for subsequent American help in India's freedom.

Lajpat Rai left New York on December 24, 1919, for London. Bidding farewell to Lalaji, Oswald Garrison Villard, Editor of the *Weekly Nation* of New York said, "He is wise, brave, sound ambassador, generous and moderate interpreter of great races to our American Democracies."²⁹

During his short stay in London, Lajpat Rai met several of his socialist friends, Hyndman, Henderson, Ramsay Macdonald, Lansbury, Col. Wedgwood, Ben Spoor M.P., and others.³⁰ He also saw Bernard Shaw.³¹ He was not allowed to deliver a speech or contribute an article to the press. The India Office "imposed complete silence"³² about his short stay in London.

²⁹Hardikar, N.S. *Lajpat Rai in America*

³⁰Letter, January 28, 1920, Lajpat Rai to H.W. Huebsch, *Huebsch Papers*.

³¹*Ibid.*

³²*Ibid.*

In fact his, work in America had been looked with great "suspicion" and his well wishers were "evidently very anxious" about his early home journey.³³ On his way back to India Lajpat Rai also visited Paris, Eden and Lausanne and reached Bombay on February 20, 1920. He was received by Bombay Congress Committee, the Home Rule league and the Bombay National Union.³⁴ There were grand illuminations. B.G. Tilak, G.S. Khaparde, Annie Besant, M.A. Jinnah and others took part in the reception.

Soon after his arrival Lajpat Rai studied the situation in India and discussed it with numerous friends. India of 1920 was radically different from India which Lajpat Rai had left in 1914. In a letter to Col. Wedgwood from Lahore on April 26, 1920 Lajpat Rai wrote: "It is an entirely new India to which I have come back; it is an awakened, self-conscious and defiant India."³⁵ Giving impression after visiting 12 district of his province he further added, "It was a newly born, a vigorous and a spirited Punjab that hailed me back." The country underwent a mental revolution as a result of the War which, though fought far away from its borders, affected deeply its economic life and its politics. The Bolshevik Revolution and President Wilson's declarations of War aims of the Allies spurred the urge among the Indians for self-government as their fundamental right on the basis of the principle of self-determination proclaimed loudly by the Allied leaders during the War. They had expected a generous gesture from the Government for all that India had suffered for the empire during the War. But the Government contrary to all hopes adopted a policy of stark repression. The repressive legislation, the inadequate reforms and disruption of Turkey all combined to result in widespread indignation among Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs against the British rule. The Punjab was seething with discontent and violent anti-British sentiment on account of Jallianwala Bagh Tragedy and the repressive policy of the Government. Lajpat Rai's old friends faced inquiries and transportation. This

³³*Ibid*

³⁴*Tribune* (Lahore), January 21, 1920.

³⁵Letter, April 26, 1920 Lajpat Rai to Col. Wedgwood, *Wedgwood Papers*.

act of unrestrained brutality and the horrors of the Martial law regime in the Punjab roused the country to a bitter determination to fight with the alien rule. In the light of these events, the British offer of constitutional reforms sounded empty and hollow. "From my reading of the situation," Lajpat wrote to Col. Wedgwood, "I conclude that the Punjab masses are thoroughly discontented and the Government has not a friend among them." "The Mussalmans," he added, "are of course very bitter, the Hindus sullen and the Sikhs thoroughly dissatisfied." He further added, "they will not voluntarily help the Government in any emergency, which may soon occur if the Afghans venture to attack India on the N.W.F."³⁶ In such situation he felt "the Mussalmans will actively sympathise and Hindus will silently watch". But Lajpat Rai believed that the "Punjab masses will not commit any violence unless provoked."³⁷ Thus Lajpat Rai found India in the throes of a militant national struggle. He was perceptive enough to gauge the depth of feeling of his countrymen and visualised the possibilities of political disturbances in the days to come.

The turning point came in the spring of 1920. The Hunter Committee Report issued on May 26, 1920 and the steps which the Government of India and the Secretary of State took thereupon eroded whatever faith was left in Indian minds regarding British professions of justice. The Committee was divided on racial lines and the Government accepted the views of the European majority. Far from condemning the ghastly act of cruelty, the Anglo Indians and the British public expressed sympathy for Dyer. The resolution of the House of Lords in his support further embittered feelings in India. Then the Treaty of Sevres on Turkey's future kindled the fire of discontent among Indian Muslims. They formed a Khilafat Committee to carry on the struggle against injustice done to Turkey, Anti-British feeling was at its height in the country.

It was in this atmosphere that the special session of the Congress was held in Calcutta on September 4, 1920. Lajpat Rai was duly elected by the All India Congress Committee as

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ *Ibid.*

President of this extra-ordinary session of the Congress. The special feature of the session which was attended by about 25,000 delegates, visitors and spectators was Gandhi's resolution for complete non-cooperation including surrender of titles and honorary offices and resignation from nominated seats in local bodies; refusal to attend Government levees, Durbars, and other official and semi-official functions held by Government officials in their honour. Gandhi promised independence in one year provided complete non-cooperation was adopted.³⁸

The presidential address of Lajpat Rai was a marvellous performance and it elicited admiration from one and all for its frankness, boldness and elegance. It was an impressive, well reasoned and bitter indictment of Sir Michael O'Dyer and his regime. He charged Sir Michael O'Dyer for all the atrocities and brutalities that had been inflicted on the Punjab. In a very forceful language Lajpat Rai strongly condemned his and his subordinates' cruel and humiliating misdeeds which had transgressed all bounds of decency. The bulk of his speech, extending to 56 pages of printed foolscap, was devoted to an exposure of what he called the Punjab atrocities.

Lajpat Rai, in the beginning, did not completely agree with Gandhi's programme of non-cooperation movement for he had his own "personal opinion on the question." The fundamental difference between Lajpat Rai and Gandhi appeared on the execution of the programme of non-cooperation. Though endorsing Gandhi's method of non-violent struggle for attaining *Swaraj*, Lajpat Rai was not in favour of launching the whole programme of non-cooperation immediately as framed by Gandhi. But that very year at the Nagpur session of the Congress, he fell in line with Gandhi. In fact Gandhi's new resolution, as Lajpat Rai writes, "Practically removes all the possible objections, at least so far as I am concerned, which I had to the old resolution."³⁹ It appears that Gandhi in presenting his resolution was keen to carry a leader of Lajpat Rai's eminence and stature with him and to offer a completely united front to the British. Shrewd tactician as he was, he accepted

³⁸A.I.C.C., File No. 18/1920 (Supplementary).

³⁹*Lala Lajpat Rai's Writings and Speeches*, Vol. II, p. 68.

Lajpat Rai's conditions. In view of this development the Punjab leader changed his previous stand, and now Lajpat Rai was ready to cooperate with Gandhi in the Nagpur Congress.

The Nagpur Congress was a turning point in Lajpat Rai's political life. His forceful speech and strong unflinching support to Gandhi and his resolution made him an outstanding leader. He was appointed a permanent member of the All India Congress Committee. The Nagpur Congress also appointed him the President of the All India Trades Union Congress to make the non-cooperation movement popular in labour organisations. He was asked to lead the non-cooperation movement in the Punjab.

The response of the country to Gandhi's call for non-violent non-cooperation was enthusiastic and widespread. Having accepted the programme of non-cooperation Lajpat Rai plunged into the struggle with complete dedication. He replaced Lala Harkishan Lal as the President of the Punjab Provincial Congress Committee, and directed the movement in the Punjab. He also undertook all India tours to spread the message of non-cooperation. In Punjab he visited Rawalpindi, Hoshiarpur, Gujranwala and Lyallpur. In Haryana he addressed big gatherings in Ambala, Bhiwani, Hissar, Karnal and Kurukshetra. To make the movement popular in rural areas a committee was formed with Lajpat Rai as President. A large number of Panchayats were set up in the villages. Lajpat Rai's forceful speeches to students resulted in a strike in Lahore Colleges—D.A.V. College, Forman Christian College, Dayal Singh College and Sanatan Dharam College. At some places attempts were made by the nationalist leaders to convert the existing educational institutions into national schools and colleges. Like others he renounced his practice in court. C.R. Das, B.C. Pal, Motilal and others in their own provinces were following the lead given by Lajpat Rai in Punjab.

When the country was thus engaged in implementing the Nagpur recommendations and non-cooperation was in full swing, the Government of India announced that the Prince of Wales would arrive in Bombay on November 17, 1921. The Government sought to exploit the traditional loyalty of Indian masses to its advantage, and thus arrested the growth of non-cooperation movement. The refusal on the part of the Congress

to cooperate at the time of Prince's visit forced the Government to adopt a policy of repression. The pace of repression was accelerated and the volunteer's organisation was declared unlawful. Gandhiji asked the people to fill the jails by courting arrest. Eminent leaders including Lajpat Rai, Motilal Nehru and C.R. Das were clamped behind the prison doors. This new appeal evoked a ready response. Thousands were led into jails. The promise of *Swaraj* within a year was in sight. Mahatma Gandhi made Bardoli his "laboratory for experiment" of the programme of refusal of taxes and he informed the Viceroy of his intention. "When all was set for the struggle", its architect decided to suspend the movement on hearing of the violent action of the mob at Chauri-Chaura in Gorakhpur District on February 5, 1922. The first phase of the new technique of national struggle thus came to an abrupt end, and Gandhiji was severely criticized for his action even by some of his ardent supporters. Lajpat Rai, Motilal Nehru, Asaf Ali, S.C. Bose and others sent from prison angry letters to Gandhi protesting against his decision.

When Lajpat Rai was released in August 1923, the Congress had split into two factions. One of them known as Swaraj party and led by C.R. Das, Motilal, S.S. Iyengar and others wanted to enter the legislative Councils and Assembly. The other party headed by C. Rajagopalachariar, Vithalbhai Patel, Rajendra Prasad and others thought that council entry was incompatible with non-cooperation and its result would be an end of the atmosphere of civil resistance. On his release he supported the Swaraj Party for he planned to fight for the national cause from within the councils. But at the same he was keen to maintain unity in the Congress ranks. He realised, "this is only possible by allowing a pro-council friends liberty of conscience and action". He did not want to repeat a Surat like split in the history of the Congress. Meanwhile a special session of the Congress was held at Delhi in September 1923. Lalaji issued a manifesto appealing for unity. Consequently the Delhi Congress resolved to concede freedom to those who were in favour of Parliamentary activity and suspended all propaganda against entering the councils. But his independent ideology could not fit in the Swaraj Party's programme. He resigned from the Swaraj Party and collaborated with M.M. Malaviya in organi-

sing the Independent Congress Party in the first week of September 1926. The new party expressed itself against the "walkout" programme of the Swarajists and also against the Congress policy on the communal question, it secured a remarkable victory in the election of 1926.

In the Central Legislative Assembly Lajpat Rai fervently espoused the popular causes, and allied himself with the Congress in opposing the unjust measures of the Government forgetting the bitter memories of the acrimonious debate of the election days; Motilal and Lajpat Rai re-established their cordial relations to work for the national cause.

Lajpat Rai was an ardent and devout Nationalist. His opposition to communal representation on the basis of separate electorates stemmed from his conviction that this would hinder the growth of Nationalism and political emancipation of the country. He, therefore, fought for joint electorates all through his life. At times he strongly opposed Congress policy of appeasing the Muslims to win their support in freedom struggle. Perhaps Lajpat Rai was the first Indian leader who rightly gauged the strength of Muslim feelings and suggested their satisfaction within the framework of Indian unity. His plan to create autonomous Muslim majority areas in a federal structure was largely with this view. Though a Nationalist Lajpat Rai wanted to protect the legitimate interests of the Hindu majority. He joined Hindu Mahasabha mainly for social and religious amelioration of the Hindus, but he never favoured the view that social and religious organisation should enter political arena. He firmly believed that the political aims and aspirations of Hindus and Muslims and other communities were identical.

In 1927 a new life was infused into the national struggle. The main factor that brought about this sudden and unexpected revival was the decision of the British Government to appoint the Indian Statutory Commission to enquire into the question of Indian Reforms. A Commission of seven members headed by Sir John Simon infuriated the Indians because there was not a single Indian member on it. The appointment of the all white commission did not come as surprise to Lajpat Rai. While in England in 1926 he had carefully observed the trends in the Indian policy of the Conservative Government and the com-

mission's composition too was anticipated by him. From the very beginning he was clear that the right course for him as well as for country was to boycott the commission. He moved a resolution in the Central Legislative Assembly urging the boycott of the commission in all stages and in all forms.⁴¹ His resolution was carried with the overwhelming support of the Indian elected members. Meanwhile he also supported the Nehru Committee which had recommended that the immediate goal of India was the attainment of the Dominion Status, that India should have a unitary government, that the system of separate electorates introduced by the Government of India Act 1909 and retained in the Act of 1919 should be abolished, that minorities should have reservation of seats in the legislative bodies for ten years, but strictly in proportion to their numbers in the population, and three new provinces where Muslims were in a majority should be created.

From February, 1928 onwards Lajpat Rai was chiefly pre-occupied with the task of mobilising public opinion in favour of the total boycott of Simon Commission and later on for the publicity of the Nehru Committee Report. For this he visited Kashmir, Madras city, Trichirapoly, Ernakulam, Cape Comerin and Trivandrum. In October he presided over the Agra Provincial Hindu Conference held at Etawah. He was back in Lahore on October 30, the day Simon Commission was to arrive at Lahore. While he was leading a mass procession against it in front of the Lahore Railway Station, he was severely struck by the police with sticks and batons. The police attack was unprovoked and wanton. He did not survive the assault very long. Within a week of the incident (Nov. 3) he went to Delhi to attend the All Parties Conference and returned to Lahore on November 8 before his scheduled programme because of ill-health. He felt angry and bitter not so much at the personal humiliation as at the national humiliation involved in the assault on him. He died on the morning of November 17, 1928.

Lajpat Rai was a versatile writer. He wrote several short

⁴¹*The Legislative Assembly Debates* (Official Report), Vol. 1, 1928, pp. 382-91.

biographies such as *Mazzani*, *Garibaldi*, *Shivaji*, *Shri Krishna* and *Swami Dayananda Saraswati*. His other important works were: *The Arya Samaj*, *Young India*, *The Political Future of India*, *England's Debt to India*, *Evolution of Japan*, *India's will to Freedom*, *Problem of National Education in India*, *United States of America*, *Unhappy India*. He was deeply interested in journalism and he founded an Urdu daily, the *Bande Matram*, and English weekly, *The People*.

Lajpat Rai's work in the field of social reform and amelioration and education is very impressive. His contribution to the growth of D.A.V. College, Lahore is well known to be recounted here. Besides this, he founded the National College, the Tilak School of Politics, Dwarka Das Library.⁴¹ The destitute children of the nation found a father in him, and he built a home for the consumptives, known as the Gulabdevi Hospital. He built up the Servants of the People Society so that patriotic youngmen should be able to devote all their times and energy to national service without the dread of starvation.

To sum up, we may say that Lajpat Rai was an ardent and devout nationalist; his life is a rare example of selfless sacrifice and dedicated exertions in the service of his country. Lajpat Rai combined in himself the best elements of an Extremist and a Moderate in his political approach, thinking and actions. He emphasised self-reliance and self-help to achieve political emancipation. In the advocacy of *Swadeshi*, boycott, national education and passive resistance for the realisation of *Swaraj*, he has his affinity with the Extremists. In demanding colonial self-government and a constitution for the Congress he is close to the Moderates. Although his deportation (1907), long exile (1914-19), arrest (1922-24) and the constant servillance by the C.I.D. impaired his health and caused him sorrow and pain, he always kept his patriotic spirit high. By his powerful writings, formation of associations and propaganda organisation he set a

⁴¹"Lalaji founded a library named 'Dwarka Das Library' in his Kothi at Lahore; and while practising at Hissar it is said that on a Diwali Day when a British D.C. Mr. Anderson came to see the illumination in city he walked upstairs into the office of Lalaji and he was surprised to see in his library not only law books but volumes on politics and he stayed there for more than an hour studying the books in the Library". Interview with Lala Harikrishna Dutta in Hissar.

new style in the fight for political emancipation. By meeting various political leaders and influential persons in Britain, America and Japan, he endeavoured to make India's problem an international issue. He strove to win their sympathy and moral support for India's struggle against foreign domination. His work as a Deputy leader of the Swaraj party in the Central Legislative Assembly and leader of the Congress Independent Party show his secular ideology, statesmanship and fervent nationalism.

.

CHAPTER ONE

With Congress Deputation to England

In April 1914 when I left India for a political trip to England I had not the least intention or desire to be absent from India for more than six months, or to visit America. At the Bar I was making good money and my prospects of early coming to the top in the profession were very bright and hopeful. Even the judges of the Chief Court (which had not yet been raised to the status of a High Court then) who at one time did not like me on account of my extreme political views and did occasionally display a kind of bias against me had changed their attitude and were taking to me more kindly. My clients trusted me implicitly and paid me good fees. In the political life of India my position was well established and it was being suggested that I would be elected president for the next session of the Indian National Congress, to be held at Madras in December 1914. Although a European war was considered likely at some not very remote time, nobody had the slightest notion that it would come so soon. My family people were very much opposed to my going out but they had reconciled themselves to my wayward doing of things and did not raise any serious obstacle to my departure. My work in the Municipal Committee had brought about a certain change in the official mind and they were coming round to the view that after all I was a reasonable man and not the kind of rabid revolutionary they had imagined me to be.

Lahore Case & Some Revolutionary Friends

The only dark cloud in the otherwise rather bright firmament of my life at that time was the apprehension that the police might in some way or other drag me in the Lahore Bomb case¹ which was at that time being tried at Delhi. Two of the accused in that case, Balraj² and Balmokand,³ had been directly and intimately associated with me—the first through his father Lala Hansraj⁴ and also through my son Pyare Krishen⁵ (then dead) and the second through his service under me as an assistant in the work of the depressed classes mission. Balraj had free access to my house and to my library and papers. Balmokand had worked with me almost on a pittance for the uplift of the depressed classes. We had opened a number of schools for the education of their children in the Jullunder Division and were planning to establish a colony of theirs on land which I had purchased across the Ravi for a sum of Rs. 25,000. He was with me for about a year and was in some way related to Bhai Parmanand.⁶ During my life I have come across a very large number of educated and half-educated young Indians who have shown the highest and the noblest traits of self-sacrifice and devotion to the service of the motherland. Balmokand, a young man of about 20 then, was one of the best of that type. His personal character was of the purest and his selflessness of the rarest type. He was very deeply attached to my person and would have any moment given his life at my bidding. I had impressed his mind with the desirability of

¹The Lahore bomb went off on 17th May, 1913 in the Lawrence Garden at Lahore with the intention of killing some Europeans. Amir Chand, Abad Behari and Balmokand were hanged in 1915-16 at Delhi.

²B. in Punjab; revolutionary; hanged in 1916.

³B. 1891; social reformer; revolutionary; implicated in bomb throwing at Lord Hardinge in 1912 and hanged.

⁴B. 1864; member of Arya Samaj; President of the D.A.V. College Managing Committee in 1912; social worker; President of the First Congress of the Arya Samajists of India and abroad; d. 1938.

⁵He was second son of Lala Lajpat Rai who died of T.B.

⁶Bhai Parmanand, B 1874; member of the Arya Samaj; implicated in the 'first Lahore Conspiracy case' and sentenced to life imprisonment in 1915; released in 1920; elected to the Central Legislative Assembly in 1931 and again in 1934; social reformer; prolific writer; d. 1947.

doing constructive social work and of not going after political fire-works. He had agreed to that and started work among the untouchables. Only once, towards the close of the year he remained with me, did he give me an inkling that his heart was not so much in constructive work as in stronger revolutionary measures for the political emancipation of his country. The story of his connexion with the revolutionary secret society was told in the trial of 1914. I do not remember the exact beginning of that connexion and its date, but be it said to his credit that when the time for action came he voluntarily left my service and went away. Balmokand was a sober serious young man, not liable to be carried away by my momentary impulses. It is clear now that he joined the revolutionary movement after full deliberation. The employment under me was only a ruse. I considered him too high-minded to practise that deception on me and recalling certain conversations he had with me on occasion during his year of service I have reason to think that being unwilling to practise deception on me he was not happy. The thing which completely put me off my guard was the fact that during this one year of service with me he married a young girl and showed great devotion towards her. As far as I can remember, the prosecution did not prove that he had any hand in the diabolical bomb throwing in the Lawrence Gardens at Lahore which was one of the principal charges against the accused in that case. The courts however found that he was one of the moving spirits of the secret organisation in pursuance of the objects of which the bomb was thrown in 1911. The accused in that case were also suspected of having been connected with the murderous attack on Lord Hardinge⁷ in December 1911 (or 1912).⁸

Balmokand was hanged and that very day his young wife died at Lahore. I knew nothing of Bhai Balmokand's con-

⁷Charles, Baron Hardinge of Penshurst (1851-1944); entered Foreign Office 1880; Ambassador to Russia 1904-6; Permanent Secretary of State 1906-10 and 1916-20; Viceroy of India 1910-1916; Ambassador at Paris 1920-22.

⁸On December 23, 1912, a bomb was thrown at the Viceroy, during his state entry into Delhi. Consequently, his attendant was instantly killed, the Viceroy himself was severely wounded by fragments of the bomb and the second attendant was injured.

nexion with the revolutionary movement until after he had been arrested. Had I known of it earlier I would have tried to persuade him away and possibly saved him for a life of better service and greater usefulness to his country. During the investigation and enquiry in that case it was apprehended, as I have said before, that the police who were by no means friendly to me might manage to drag me in. I have no doubt that they tried their best to involve me but got no evidence, and I did not leave India until after the case for the prosecution had been closed.

A Congress Delegation

The fact that I went straight to England and stayed there for over six months before I left for America disposes of the theory that I left India out of fear. The facts are that at the session of the Indian National Congress held at Karachi in December 1913 it was resolved to send a deputation of Congressmen to England in connexion with a Bill for the reform of the India office at Whitehall, which Lord Crewe⁹ was expected to introduce in Parliament early in the spring of 1914. The members of this deputation were to be selected by the provincial organisations affiliated to the Congress who were to be responsible for the expenses of the trip in case the delegate himself could not find the same. In pursuance of this resolution the following gentlemen were selected by the provinces put against their names :—

1. Babu Bhupendra Nath Basu¹⁰—Bengal
2. Babu Krishna Sahai¹¹—Behar.

⁹Robert Offley Ashburton Crewe-Milnes, second Baron Houghton and Marquis of Crewe (1858-1945); Viceroy of Ireland 1892-95; Lord President of the Council 1905-8 and 1915-16; Lord Privy Seal 1908-11; Colonial Secretary 1908-10; Secretary of State for India 1910-15; Ambassador at Paris 1922-08; Secy. of state for War 1931.

¹⁰B. 1959; attorney of the Calcutta High Court; President of the Indian National Congress 1914; member of Secretary of State's Council 1817-24; d. 1924.

¹¹B. 1886; Vice Chairman of the Reception Committee of the Bankipore Session in 1912; conferred the title of Rai Bahadur in 1912; member of the Executive Council of the Lt. Governor, and afterwards Governor of Bihar and Orissa; d. 1921.

3. Mr. M.A. Jinnah¹²—Bombay.
4. Mr. Samartha¹³—Bombay.
5. Myself—Punjab.

I was eager to go because my past experience had proved to me the extreme usefulness of occasional trip to Europe, both politically and educationally. A trip to Europe was a great education and inspiration. It was besides politically useful.

The other members of the deputation left in April. I could not go with them because of the case mentioned above. I was personally interested in the case and was also interested in saving Balraj and Balmokand. After the evidence, for the prosecution was finished, I was permitted and advised by Lala Hansraj and other friends to go.

I left Lahore for Bombay towards the end of April and reached London on the 17th of May. My colleagues had already seen Lord Crewe, the secretary of State for India, and discussed with him the provisions of the Bill he was going to introduce in the House of Lords. Babu Bhupendra Nath Basu was the informal head of our delegation; he was in close touch with the officials of the India Office and with other British statesmen, and best man by temper and training to carry on negotiations. He told us from time to time what the authorities wanted to be done, how far they would go and what was practicable or otherwise. Under his guidance we prepared notes and submitted them to the Secretary of State for India for his consideration.¹⁴ What consideration he gave them was only known to Bhupendra Babu.

India Council Bill

The Bill which Lord Crewe introduced was a typically Whig measure, which satisfied no one and provoked opposition from all sides. When the delegation left India the provision of

¹²B. 1876; barrister of the Bombay High Court; President of the Muslim League 1916, 1920, and from 1934 till his death in 1948; Governor General of Pakistan 1947-48.

¹³Narayan Mahadeva Samartha, Vakil, Bombay; later on Member, Council of Secretary of State; joint secretary, Bombay Presidency Association, 1914.

¹⁴See Appendix I.

the Bill had not been published and Indian opinion on it had not been expressed. When the provisions became known the Indian Press expressed great dissatisfaction. At best their support was half-hearted and very much qualified. Even the delegation was divided in its opinions. Personally I saw no reason to welcome it but our chief was pledged to its support and for the sake of unanimity we submitted notes to the Secretary of State in which we suggested radical changes but gave our general support to the Bill. The Bill was, however, very stoutly opposed by the Tory Party and the Tory Press raised quite a howl over it. In the course of a leading article published on the 7th of July the *London Times* remarked:—

—and the British Press

“The House of Lords return to-day to the consideration of the Council of India Bill, and we venture again to express our hope that this mischievous measure will be rejected without even receiving the compliment of reference to a Select Committee. In a letter published in these columns yesterday Mr. Edwin Montagu¹⁵ who until recently was Under-Secretary for India, did not seek to deny that he is the real author of the Bill. It is common knowledge that during the last eighteen months of his sojourn at India Office Mr. Montagu was zealously preparing a scheme intended to hamstring the Council of India. Never before in our recollection has even the most ambitious of Under-Secretaries attempted to carry so sweeping and, we may add, so reprehensible a scheme. The motive was obvious, for we discern it immediately when we turn from the protestations of Mr. Montagu to the more ingenious explanations of Lord Crewe. An earlier Under-Secretary for India once declared that his influence was so circumscribed that he always felt like ‘a pert at the gate of paradise.’ Mr. Montagu has made a deft attempt to create a little paradise of his own for himself and his successors. Here is Lord Crewe’s own statement of one effect of the Bill:—

“ ‘What is to be done is that the chief of a department and

¹⁵B. 1879; M.P. 1906-22; Under-Secretary for India 1910-14; Financial Secretary to the Treasury 1914-16; Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster 1915, Minister of Munitions 1916; resigned in 1916; Secretary of State for India 1917-22; d. 1924.

a particular member of the Council can, in consultations with the Under-Secretary of State arrive at conclusions on a number of matters which have now to go through a whole series of Committee stages." Let us interpret Lord Crewe's statement a little more definitely. Under this Bill we may see an India Office clerk who has probably never seen India, a Hindu platform politician with no practical training whatever, and some aspiring young substitute for Mr. Montagu meeting together and fully empowered to make and to telegraph to India decisions upon matters with which none of them will be in the least degree competent to deal. Such is the 'elastic' and 'adaptable' method with which Mr. Montagu seeks to replace the Council of India, decried by Lord Morley¹⁶ in 1907 as 'this important and ruling body'. Mr. Montagu suggests that India has changed so profoundly that past experience is of no value in dealing with its problems. We prefer to say that we deeply distrust conclusions based upon the brief tenure of desk at the India Office and a single cold weather perambulation of the Dependency. We have asked to believe that people of India are eager to see this bill carried and a deputation from the Indian National Congress is now in this country to watch the progress of the measure. The real truth is that the Congress delegates left India before the text of the Bill was made known and that almost all sections of public opinion in India now oppose it. We say nothing about the Government of India, who, it is said, have never been consulted at all. We say nothing about the Indian Civil Service, which is believed to condemn the measure root and branch. We lay no stress upon the opposition of the Anglo-Indian Press, and the telegrams of protest which are pouring in from the Chamber of Commerce and other public bodies. The most prominent factor at the moment is, as our Bombay correspondent informed us in a telegram published last Friday, that since the provisions of the Bill have been made public it has received the most vehement condemnation at the hands of the Indian Press. While the Congress delegates are cooling their

¹⁶B. 1838; statesman and man of letters; Chief Secretary for Ireland 1886 and 1892-5; Secretary of State for India 1905-10; created Viscount 1908; d. 1923.

heels in the lobbies at 'Westminster', the *Bombay Chronicle*, the principal and authoritative organ of the Congress is urging Lord Curzon to press for the rejection of the Bill. The reason is obvious.

"What passes comprehension is demeanour of the delegates. The best known among them, Mr. Lajpat Rai, yesterday publicly advocated the entire abolition of the Council. He came to England to plead for larger Indian representation upon it, and now clamours for it to be wiped out of existence.

"The organs of Indian opinion subject to the Bill because they do not want to send dummy members to a truncated Council which will meet only at the pleasure of the Secretary of State. We endorse their reason, but we lay even stronger stress upon others—one of which is that the elective principle in any form should never be applied to the Secretary of State's Council. It would be just as reasonable, and just as improper, to request India to elect members to the Viceroy's Council. The council of India does not sit in India and it performs functions which have no analogy to any system of representative Government. We are strongly in favour of a thorough reform of the India Office. The pressing necessity for such a reform has been constantly urged by the *Times*. The true remedy is, not to accept Mr. Montagu's specious plea for more expeditious methods of handling enormous masses of trivial detail which now pass through the India Office, but to cut down the dense undergrowth of unnecessary business and superfluous correspondence between India and England."

More Tory Criticism of the Whig Bill

The Morning Post in its issue of July 1st had a leading article on the Council of India. The first part of it dealt with the history of the Council and pointed out its consultative character. It insisted on India being governed by men on the spot and not from without. It said:

"The aim of its creators was to leave the Secretary of State responsible to parliament for the administration of his department, but to give him the opportunity of taking the advice of people acquainted with India, and the Council therefore consists, in the main, of retired Anglo-Indian civilians. Their opinions on some subjects may be perhaps a little anti-

quoted, their faculties in some cases rather less active than they were in their prime. But on the other hand the principles of administration are eternal and what is wanted at the India Office is not so much initiative as caution. India should be governed from India, and not from Whitehall: the India Office should rather be a check and an arbiter than an administrator, and it is just here that in our view the present Government have made a mistake. They have interfered with the administrative action of the Government of India and have meddled with its legislative machinery. In doing so they have no doubt been compelled to ignore and disregard the only expert opinion in this country—the opinion of the council. But the Act of 1858 compelled them at least to submit questions to the Council for opinion, and to act for certain purposes in Council. We may well suppose that they found these sage and experienced councillors unsympathetic to schemes for applying pseudo-democratic ideas to a country which despises democracy and believes in caste, and to impossible compromises between Government by consent and Government by power. They have, therefore, in the present Bill designed to reduce the Council almost to a nullity by reducing its numbers and quorum, abolishing the statutory requirements as to meetings, and enlarging indefinitely the area of subjects in which the Secretary may dispense with the Council altogether. In these provisions the Bill is, as Lord Curzon¹⁷ pointed out in his very able speech, a long step toward autocracy.

“But in another aspect the Bill provides for an altogether different character. It seeks to inoculate the Government of India with yet another homeopathic dose of democracy. In 1907 the Government appointed two natives¹⁸ of India to the Council, and this practice has continued since that time. The proposal now is to make this new custom statutory, and not only so, but to provide that these Indian members shall be chosen on an elective principle. Now the Government of India

¹⁷George Nathaniel, first Marquis Curzon of Kedleston (1859-1925) Under Secretary for India 1891-2; Viceroy of India 1898-1905; Lord President of the Council and member of the War Cabinet 1916-18; Foreign Secretary 1919-24.

¹⁸In August 1907 Mr. K.G. Gupta and Syed Hussain Bilgrami were appointed members of the India Council.

is not a popular or responsible government, and never can be as long as England rules India. The day that India rules itself, that day England retires its last official, and its last centurion from the Peninsula, India through weakness, division, and anarchy over a long period of time gradually fell under the dominion of a power which had strength, unity and purpose. But let us not flatter ourselves that the subjection was involuntary, or that our Empire would continue if India had the power and the unity to shake herself free. It therefore follows that if we deliver any part of our power into the hands of an Indian race or interest we thereby weaken ourselves and hasten the time of our departure. We should make it our ideal not to part with our power.

“The Indian people—we mean the peasants—have no representative and no friend save only the Government of India itself. In these circumstances we cannot see that the election of these two Indian members would be either truly democratic or truly useful.”

The Bill was, of course, rejected and no one was very sorry for it except perhaps the leader of the Indian delegation. But the comments of the Tory and the Liberal Press over the fact of the Bill are so interesting and amusing even to-day that I propose to give a few extracts from them.

More Press Comment

The *Pall Mall Gazette* was furious over the conduct of Mt. Montagu. It said:—

“The tone of young Mr. Montagu, for instance has been markedly misplaced, elaborately impertinent and full of the clever immaturity which creates anything but confidence. This has been of considerable disservice both to the Government and himself.”

“We are not concerned to deny that there was some point and reasonableness in part of Lord Morley’s answer to the heavy indictment accumulated against him by Lord Curzon, Lord Roberts,¹⁹ and Lord Ampthill.²⁰ But change in the tradi-

¹⁹Charles Roberts, b. 1865; MP 1906-18 and 1922-3; Under-Secretary of State for India 1914-15; d. 1959.

²⁰Oliver Arthur Ampthill Villiers Russell, Baron, b. 1869; President of the Oxford Union Society 1891; Private Secretary to Rt. Hon. J. Chamberlain; Governor of Madras 28 December 1900 to April 30, 1904.

tional methods of our rule in the East has of late gone on quite fast enough. The important event of last night forces delay and re-examination, and, we hope, will eventually result in an agreement of parties upon a modified measure. This is not a subject for tears."

The *Outlook* said:—

"The 'World's Work' gave the following estimate of the functions of the Council of India:—The Council of India exists for no other purpose than to be conservative. Its business is to see that violent changes and measures of reform and scrutinised and delayed. This is the very function which one would gather is useful in the special case, and Ministers ought to pocket their natural impatience for the sake of the enduring value of a slow system. India ought not to feel too quickly a change of persons and policy in England. On the contrary, India should think England more conservative than itself."

Semi-Official Defence

The *London Nation* at the time more or less the mouthpiece of the Liberal Government wrote:—

"Lord Curzon has had his way with the India Council Bill, which was refused a second reading in the Upper House on Tuesday by 96 to 38. It was a party vote, and several of the Opposition speakers echoed Lord Curzon's point that a Government nearing the end of its term had no business to touch any matter of such importance. Behind this merely obstructive attitude, which reflects the passion of the Irish crisis there were, however, real grounds of opposition. They were stated with a curious lack of consistency. Lord Curzon argued that the Bill would ruin the authority of the Council itself, and make the Secretary of State a pure autocrat. It is human nature, we suppose, that no autocrat can tolerate another. On the other hand, Lord Ampthill complained that the Bill would ruin 'the power and prestige of the Viceroy', and that India hence forward would be governed from Whitehall. Both of them agreed in deprecating especially the reduction of the importance of the purely official Anglo-Indian element on the Council. Perhaps the inconsistency is more apparent than real. What both mean at bottom is that in the last resort India ought to be governed, not by a Minister responsible to Parliament but by a bureau-

crazy whose chief is the Viceroy, and whose organ in London is a Council of veteran officials.

* * * *

“Lord Morley made a spirited and strongly worded defence of the Bill. He denied that the Minister’s position had altered in regard to the Council. The changes in procedure were intended solely to expedite routine business. No paper, however, trivial could be dealt with in less than a month. So far from wishing to confine the Council to men who have had administrative experience, he wished to introduce men who knew India from other standpoints. He dwelt on the disappointment which would be caused in India by the rejection of the Bill, which would be, he predicted, “something like a disaster, and certainly a grave blunder.” In this connexion while the *Times* has suggested that Indian opinion is ceasing to desire the Bill, the real fact seems to be, as Lord Crewe stated, that such opposition as there is from Indians is due to their demand that Indian members of the Council should be directly elected.

* * * *

“The Bill in reality raised three issues—the extent to which the Council ought to be non-official in its personnel, the manner in which Indians should be represented, and the degree of its control over the Minister. On this last point it was, to our thinking, unsatisfactory, and required an amendment, and Lord Crewe’s admission in the debate that the whole policy of the removal of the capital to Delhi was presented to the Council only as a *fait accompli*, goes to show how much its authority stands in need of strengthening.”

My Own Views

My own feelings about the Bill were reflected in a letter which I wrote to the *New Statesman* and was published by it in its issue of 11th July:

“The Council of India Bill is dead. The Tory party in the House of Lords made short work of it, though they spoilt a great deal of logic in doing so.

"The fact is that the Bill satisfied nobody and evoked no enthusiasm. Even the speeches made in its support were half-hearted. The Tories opposed it because it professed to introduce an element of election into the constitution of the Council, because it reduced the Council in size, and because it gave enhanced powers to the Secretary of State. The Indians did not like it because it did not go sufficiently far to make their representation adequate and effective. Even the supporters of the Secretary of State were not sure about it, as they wished to refer it to a Select Committee. The delegates of the Indian National Congress were prepared to accept it as a first instalment of the intended reform, though they never concealed their disappointment at the inadequate representation of independent Indian opinion, and particularly at the proposed method of selection of Indian members. The expressions of adverse opinion in certain Indian newspapers were made use of by the Tories in support of their own opposition to the bill without an honest recognition of the grounds on which these opinions were based. The Indian (as distinguished from the Anglo-Indian) Press disapproved of the Bill because the concessions were so trifling. It failed to recognise that India is likely to fare even worse if the reform of the India Office is undertaken by the Tories. There can be no doubt, after the speeches made by the Tory Lords, that they intend to raise the question if and as soon as they return to power; and the Indians are not likely to get from them even as much as was conceded by this Bill.

"On the other hand, the Liberal Government may be made wiser by the rejection of the Bill. There is not much use in doing things half-heartedly. If you decide to give, ungrudgingly and magnanimously. When a small concession such as was made in the Bill now dead cannot be carried through parliament it shakes Indian confidence in British statesmanship. If the Government had conceived this Bill in a spirit of generous statesmanship it would have not only deprived the opposition of one of its chief weapons, but by evoking the gratitude of the Indian community it would have aroused such an amount of enthusiasm in India as would have been difficult, even for the Tories to ignore.

"What amused the Indians who were present most was the

statement made by Lord Sydenham²¹ that there was no public opinion in India; and that the elective principle would be opposed by the bulk of the population. *Public opinion in India* has grown quite familiar with the trick often employed by reactionary ex-governors of opposing the demands of the intellectual classes by saying that any advance towards popular government would be resented by the chiefs of India. The chiefs might be asked whether they preferred the rule of Lord Curzon, and what they think of the Political Agents who have been set over them, in several cases in violation of the treaties made with their predecessors in the early days. It passes one's comprehension what objection the chiefs can be supposed to have to the election, of the Indian members of the Secretary of States' Council by the elected members of the Indian Legislative Councils, and in what way can they be better served by nominated members.

"But it is useless to grumble at sophistry not seeing its own fallacies. One Lord went so far as to say that what was wanted in the British administration of India was not sympathy but justice and impartiality, thereby repudiating the gracious remark of His Majesty the King himself. Indian opinion, however, would support him to the letter if it could be sure of getting "justice and impartiality" between Indians and Englishmen. Can a man who exploits others over be just to the latter in the proper sense of the term? Why talk of justice and impartiality? Talk of might. One of the leading Tory organs in London has been more honest in this respect than any of the Lords who spoke on the Bill. In the course of a leading article discussing the provisions of the Bill and commenting on the selection of the Indian members from a partly elected panel, it remarked that after all India was won by the sword and must be held by the sword. This, in truth, is the view of the Tory Party in a nutshell. No Indian would quarrel with it, however he may dislike it, if it were put frankly and honestly whenever there is a demand for a larger share in the Government. Indians think better of those who speak the truth even

²¹George Sydenham Clarke, Baron Sydenham of Combe (1848-1933), Governor of Victoria 1901-3; Governor of Bombay 1907-13; created Baron 1913.

though it be distasteful. But to talk of justice, impartiality, of the good of India, and so on, is adding insult to injury, and it deceives no one.

"The summary rejection of a small measure like this, introduced by a government in power, is bound to make an unfortunate impression in India. I am of opinion that Indians would do better to agitate for the complete abolition of the Council than for its reform. It is a white elephant maintained at the cost of the Indian taxpayer. It is the strongest fortress of the bureaucracy. Unless it is destroyed there can be no hope of Indians getting any substantial voice in the management of the affairs of their country."

The Bill was thus buried "unwept, unhonoured and unsung."

I have given these quotations for several reasons. These articles were written immediately before the war. The war, it was said, had effected a change "in the angle of vision" with which Indian affairs were looked at in England and by Englishmen. Since the war we have had important changes in the machinery of the Government in India but the centre of gravity is still where it was. The Secretary of State still rules India autocratically from Whitehall. He dictates and dominates the Government of India.

The present Secretary of State (Birkenhead)²² is a Tory and as much opposed to the progress of India towards self-government as his predecessors in office were and curiously enough the arguments used by him and the English Press are almost exactly the same. That is the progress we have made in these last 14 years. Much water has flowed under the bridges, but we are practically where we were so far at least as the authority of the Secretary of State for India is concerned. It is he who lays down the lines on which an Indian Reserve Bank can be created. It is he who guides the destinies of India from a distance of 6,000 miles with the help of a Council as antiquated and ante-diluvian as the one which Morley had to deal with.

²²Frederick Edwin Smith, first Earl of Birkenhead (1872-1930). M.P. 1906-18; Attorney General 1915-19; Lord Chancellor 1919-22; Secretary of State for India 1924-8; d. 1930.

CHAPTER TWO

The Indian Politicians and Wedderburn

The Indian politicians who went to England for political work often consulted him (Wedderburn)¹ and he did his best in making things smooth for them. His advice and help was almost indispensable to us. When I reached England he was away at Vichy (France). He returned to England on the 14th June and the very next morning I met him at 84 Palace Chambers by appointment. From Vichy, he had written to me to say that he was going to meet all the delegates at 11 A.M. and he would like me to come at 10.15 A.M. as he wanted to have "a little conversation before the other delegates come in". At the meeting the principal subject of discussion was Lord Crewe's India office Bill, but it appears that between the 15th and the 19th we also discussed the state of unrest in the Punjab and I suggested to him the presentation of a note to the India Office giving our views on the situation as well as our suggestions for its improvement. In a letter dated the 19th June from Meredith (his country home) he wrote:

Dear Mr. Lajpat Rai,

Thinking over our conversation of yesterday, I would

¹B. 1838; entered Indian Civil Service 1860; Judge of the Bombay High Court 1885; officiating Chief Secretary to Bombay Government 1886-7; retired 1887; M.P. 1893-1900; Chairman of the Indian Parliamentary Committee; President of the Indian National Congress 1889 and 1910; d. 1918.

suggest, in order to make your recommendations as definite as possible that they should be framed as an answer to the condition of public feeling in the Punjab and the injury to Indian from secret conspiracy and outrage, what steps should be taken to bring the younger generation of educated men into more active sympathy with orderly progress.

The answer might be directed into (a) the present unsatisfactory condition of public feeling, (b) its causes, and (c) the remedy.

Such a statement, prepared in consultation with Messrs. Gokhale² and Bhupendra Nath, would, I think, be very useful, in showing that repression aggravates the evil, and that the remedy is to be found in creating atmosphere of confidence and goodwill.

Yours sincerely,
W. WEDDERBURN

on the 20th he again wrote:—

Dear Mr. Lajpat Rai,

Your letter of yesterday crossed mine, in which I suggested the form of your statement. There is no doubt that the matter is a very important one, as offering to the Government a constructive policy which they may oppose to the pressure that is being brought to obtain increased security.

Lady Wedderburn and I shall be much pleased if you will come here for a week-end, when we can go into the question in consultation with Mr. Bhupendra Nath who will be with us.

Yours sincerely,
W. WEDDERBURN

On the 24th of the same month he again wrote to me not to fail to come and "bring a draft of the proposed statement to be a basis to work upon." It appears that I could not go to meet him at Meredith as desired. So on the 4th July he wrote to me again from Meredith informing me that he had asked the delegates to meet him at 3 p.m. on Monday but that

²B. 1866; teacher and journalist at Poona; member of the Bombay Legislative Council 1901-15; President of the I.N.C. 1905.

he should like a talk with me about "Unrest" and would like me to see him at 12 with a draft of my proposals.

On the 7th July, as already recorded, the Bill was rejected and with that ended the formal official work for which we had come. But I remember that we represented to the Secretary of State several notes dealing with subjects other than the Bill, but I cannot recollect what became of the idea of presenting a statement relating to unrest. Probably we could not come to an agreement as to its contents and it had to be dropped.

CHAPTER THREE

Indians and Canada

The position of Indians in the Dominions in general and in Canada in particular was one of the burning questions of the day in May, June and July 1914. It had been brought into prominence by Bawa Gurdit Singh's¹ enterprise in taking "a shipload of Hindus" to the shores of Canada in a ship specially chartered for the purpose, with a view to test the legality of the immigration rules of British Columbia² which denied admittance to Indians unless they had travelled to Canada in the same ship directed from India, which was an impossibility.

¹B. 1860; hero of the *Komagata Maru* affair (1914); imprisoned for five years in 1920; d. 1954.

²Approximately 4,000 Indians, mostly Punjabi Sikhs, migrated to British Columbia on the Pacific Coast of Canada at the close of the 19th century and the first decade of the twentieth. The Canadian Government in order to prohibit further immigration from India adopted stringent measures. The most notorious of these was Canadian Privy Council Order No. 920, generally known as "continuous journey clause". This order had virtually the effect of prohibiting Indians, not already settled in Canada, from going there as there was no steamship service between the two countries and the steamship companies refused through bookings. The order also caused acute hardship to the Indian settlers in Canada as it prevented them from bringing their wives and children. In 1914 an attempt was made to obviate these difficulties and a ship, the *Komagata Maru*, was chartered by Indians to take about 400 immigrants to Canada. The Canadian authorities refused to allow landing of these men when the ship arrived at Vancouver, British Columbia. The tragic end of this voyage of the *Komagata Maru* is well known.

Ordinary ships carrying passengers to western Canada, would not carry an Indian except on the penalty of being forced to take him back to his port of embarkment free of return fare. At great cost and with commendable self-sacrifice Bawa Gurdit Singh of the Punjab who was a contractor in China and had made some money there chartered a Japanese ship and took about 500 Sikhs to the shores of Canada. These Sikhs were not allowed to disembark, and a strict guard was posted in the coastal sea on the shore to prevent the landing of any of the passengers. One of these passengers, through his lawyer applied to the local court for a writ of *habeas corpus* which was denied. His application to the Supreme Court was also dismissed and eventually the ship was forced back with its human cargo. On reaching England in May I started taking interest in the matter and besides seeing the Under-Secretary of State for India saw other persons in connexion therewith seeking their intervention. I interviewed the important editors and also wrote to the press pointing out the dangers of the policy and the impropriety of the Dominion Government's stand. Mr. Charles Roberts was then Under-Secretary at the India Office. He was very sympathetic but it was obvious that the India Office had neither the will nor the power to make an issue of it with the Dominion. The English press was as usual united as well as decided in the matter. The Tory press was opposed and the *Time* in the course of a leading article pointed out the eternal truth of Kipling's³ verdict that "East is East and West is West. And never the twain shall meet." The Liberal papers did publish my letters and otherwise took a sympathetic view of the situation pointing out the likely evil consequences of a conflict between the East and the West but they did not definitely commit themselves to any specific course of action. During the three months before the breaking out of the war the English press was full of this subject and article appeared in all the leading organs of public opinion. On the 23rd of June Mr. Charles Roberts, the Under-Secretary of State for India, wrote to me to say that the Canadian Statesman Mr.

³Joseph Rudyard Kipling, B. 1865 in Bombay, India; wrote poems, short stories, children's stories, novels, travel sketches; d. 1936.

Henri Bourassa⁴ was anxious to meet me. Two days latter I received a letter from Mr. Bourassa which ran as follows :—

“As you have been informed by Mr. Charles Roberts, Under Secretary of the State for India, I take a deep interest in Indian matters, even apart from the acute difficulty existing at present between our respective countries(I am from Canada). I have read with much interest and sympathy the two letters of yours which appeared in *New Leader* of the 11th and 12th instant and I would be delighted to have a conversation with you on the growth of nationalism in India.

“Would you do me the pleasure of coming here on Monday next, 29th instant, at one o'clock? We would then go and have lunch together at some quiet place and compare facts and sentiments as between nationalism in India and nationalism in Canada.”

Mr. Henry Bourassa was then the leader of French Canadian Liberals in the Canadian Parliament. He was a man of great culture, power and influence and edited a daily paper in Montreal. His object in wanting to meet me was quite different from what Mr. Charles Roberts thought. I met Mr. Bourassa by appointment and a long talk with him in London (After that we met once in the U.S.A.). He threw the whole responsibility of the anti-Asiatic policy of the Dominion on the British and was interested more in the general development of democracy in the world than in the particular question of an open door policy for Indians in Canada. It was a great pleasure to meet him but he could provide me no relief in the matter in which I was immediately interested. All our efforts in England failed to bring any relief to the *Komagata* victims of British Imperialism. As a matter of history I give below a few extracts from an article written for the *Daily News* by its editor[Mr. A.C. Gardiner, with whom I had the pleasure of talking about India :—

A shipload of Hindus is not, superficially a matter of much importance, and yet it is not impossible that if we could see

⁴B. 1868; journalist; editor and owner of *L'Interprete*; editor-in-Chief of *Le Devoir*, 1910-32; member of the House of Common for several years; leader of the Nationalists; published books, pamphlets; d. 1953.

the events of our time through the eyes of the historian of 2014 we should find that quite the most significant thing to be seen in the world to-day is the *Komagata Maru*, with its 350 Hindus abroad, that lies at Victoria, British Columbia. It is a challenge thrown down, not only to the British Empire, but to the claim of the white man to possess the earth. It differs by its direct and explicit demand, from all other attempts of the coloured man to go where he is not wanted. The Hindus do not come as suppliants, but as claimants. They knock at the gate of Canada and ask for admission as a right of the British citizen to access to any part of the British Empire. And British Columbia has shut the gate in their face and has declared that British Empire will not allow the coloured man to make his home within its borders.

The Hosts of Asia

It does this on the most frankly material ground. If the coloured man comes, the white man goes. "We have a considerable number of them with us now", says the *Victoria (B.C.) Times*. They have entered into competition with white labour, and in every instance where competition has occurred the white labourer has been obliged to succumb". That is the experience always in California where the white competitor fades away before the Japanese invader in the fruit fields, in South Africa where the Indian trader bankrupts his English rival, in the mercantile marine where the Asiatic sailor undercuts the British sailor wherever their coloured man comes with his few wants, his long hours, his incessant labour and his low standard of life he triumphs. Nor is he only an economic menace. He is a social menace too. We have but to imagine Canada for example over-run by Indians, Chinese and Japanese to understand something of the alarm with which the invasion of the Asiatic fills the white men. He feels that it would mean the scrapping his ideals and the end of his civilisation.

And so wherever we look around the Pacific and the Indian ocean—New Zealand, Australia, California, Canada, South Africa—we see the English-speaking faces filled with disquiet raising their defensive walls higher and higher, sharpening

their weapons and preparing for what they believe to be the inevitable struggle with Asia, a struggle as inevitable, says the *New Zealand Herald* as the rising of the sun. The *Komagata Maru* is only a single spy. Behind it they see all the hosts of Asia waiting to descend upon their shores.

A White Man's World

This dread of the Asiatic is the dominant fact in the world today and it will largely govern the politics of the twentieth century. It is of course a relatively new fact. Until less than a generation ago the right of the white man to inherit the earth belonged to the category of indisputable axioms. His adventurous spirit had carried him far and wide and he had raised his flag, usually the British flag, over all the great waste places of the globe, brushing the little people aside from his path in his masterful stride. The red man melted before him in America, the black man before him in Australia. He laid India under tribute and cut up Africa as if he were cutting up a cake, allotting this section to the German, that to the French, another to the Portuguese, a fourth to the Belgian, the largest share to the Englishman.

There was no question in all this of asking leave of the natives. The white man would have as little thought of asking the natives whether they wanted him to take possession of their land as of asking the Kanagaroo or the buffaloes. He had the argument of force and he easily construed that into a Divine authority for his dominion over palm and pine. His attitude to the subject peoples was in keeping with this view. Here he enslaved them, there he tortured and slew them elsewhere he sought to govern them justly and civilise them. He gave them some times the Bible and some time rum, his tastes and not seldom his diseases. He carried them in thousands from Africa to till the Virginian fields and incidentally to sow the seed of a great colour problem for himself in modern America. He brought them from India in thousands to enrich himself by their labour in Natal and incidentally sowed the seed of a great problem himself in the South Africa of today. But behind all this varying methods there was one dominant unquestioned idea. Everywhere he proceeded upon the assumption that the white man was born to possess the earth and that the coloured man

was born to be his hewer of wood and drawer of water, used if he needed him and thrown aside if he did not need him.

The Challenge of Asia

This simple creed is by no means so clear and indisputable today. We talk less unctuously about the "white man's burden" and are concerned much more about the white man's fear. For we know that something is happening that may change the balance of the earth. Asia is turning in her sleep. She no longer conforms to Arnold's⁵ vision of her.—

She heard the legions thunder past,
Then turned in thought again.

She has discovered that she can raise legions of her own, and has caught something of our western modernism and unrest. Her deity still sits with her eyes turned inward, in eternal contemplation and her most distinguished poet chants the ancient reverie of self-absorption. But the people have passed the deity and the poet by. They have become self-conscious. They are asking questions, cultivating political ideas, looking out on the world with wide, adventurous eyes. When Okura, after the Russo-Japanese War⁶, said "We have destroyed the hypnotism colour" he put in a phrase not only the deepest less of the war but the challenge of Asia to the white man's world. He announced that henceforth the Asiatic had to be reckoned with, and that the heritage of the earth was to be decided by other considerations than the colour of the skin.

Barring the Door

It is impossible that he was thinking of the white man's argument of force. And no doubt it is the thought of Mukden and the Sea of Japan that keeps the New Zealanders awake at night. But the challenge of force if ever it comes, must be remote. Japan won its war, it is true, but it discovered as so

⁵Sir Edwin Arnold, B. 1832; poet and journalist; published *The Light of Asia*; toured Asia; d. 1904.

⁶The Russo-Japanese War was fought in 1904-5 in which Japan defeated Russia.

many others have discovered, that a victory may be as disastrous as a defeat, and its impoverishment will make it think long before it openly assails the white man's hegemony of the Pacific. It is not force, but peaceful penetration that has to be met, and time will show whether it is possible for the white lands of the Pacific to keep out the tide of colour. Australia and New Zealand have barred and bolted their doors against Asia. Neither Japanese nor Chinese, nor Hindu can gain a foothold there. It is an heroic policy. If they can people their soil, that policy may prevail, but they know that they are in peril so long as they hold a continent with a population hardly bigger than that of Wales.

In the same way South Africa has closed its door against the Hindu, but it has closed it too late to get rid of the problem. For half a century it brought in the indentured Indian for the needs of the white planters and now, having discovered how keen a competitor he is in the field of commerce, it has tried to repudiate its bonds and to tax him out of the country. The attempt has failed as it deserved to fail, and this week we have seen the South African Government bringing in a measure of relief which establishes the Indians in their right to live free and unmolested in the country. And if we want to see how Imperial considerations vanish before private interests we have only to look at the opposition which comes to this measure from the great Imperialist mine-owners, as well as from the Natal planters. The mineowners objected to removing £ 3 tax per head from the Indians. Why? Because, they said, it would be followed by a similar demand in regard to the natives. And if the natives were not taxed they would not go into the mines. In other words, the Indian is to be taxed out of the country in order that the native may be taxed into the mines. That is Imperialism without disguise.

Measures that Fail

But this is by the way. The immediate point is the difficulty of coping with the invasion. How impossible it is to keep out the tide by half measures is shown by the experience of Canada and California. The latter state has passed Chinese Exclusion laws and has more than once brought the United States to the

brink of a grave crisis with Japan because of its fierce antipathy to the Japanese; but still they are there. And the case of Canada is not less remarkable. British Columbia has tried the Natal Act and other defences. It has put a head tax of £100 on every Chinese immigrant and of £40 on every Asiatic, it has limited the number of Japanese who may come into the country in a year to 600, and it has further checkmated the Hindu by refusing to allow him to come except direct from his own country. Indeed the Hindu is more rigorously excluded than anyone. But still through mischievous chinks the Asiatics flow in. Despite the necessity of providing the possession of £100 no fewer than 6,817 Chinese entered British Columbia in 1911, 7,146 in 1912 and over 6,000 in 1913. The Japanese immigration is always somehow higher than the maximum allowed. They are smuggled in by all sorts of ingenious tricks. Not long ago a Japanese steamer was seized at Port Simpson. When she left Japan she had 100 Japanese on board. When she was seized only the crew was there. The captain of the vessel was fined, but he had "delivered the goods" safely somewhere on the coast.

The effect is visible in many industries. The saw-mills of British Columbia, which used to be worked by white labour, are now almost wholly worked by Chinese, Japanese and Hindus. A score of years ago the Pacific Coast fisheries used to employ thousands of white men. Now they are controlled the Japanese, for, while the Chinese are content to do the drudgery of life, the Japanese in America like the Indian in South Africa, is a man who not only lives cheaply but has that commercial genius which makes him a rival of the employer as much as of the employed. Restrictions, in short, no matter how severe, have failed to keep out the Asiatic and the demand from British Columbia to the Dominion Parliament for total exclusion grows daily more insistent. "Give us a white British Columbia" is the cry.

"Making Hay" of the Empire

It will be seen incidentally how this grave question "makes hay" of the British Empire. The Imperialists of South Africa shut the door against the Hindus and vote to tax out those who are already in and the British citizen of Canada builds

his wall high against all Asiatics, but most high against the Hindus. And yet the Hindu is a British citizen—witness the proclamation of Queen Victoria—whose claims, since he is not self-governing, are peculiarly entitled to protection. The Imperial Government are, of course, in a hopeless position. They cannot on the one hand ignore the grievances of the Indians; on the other they cannot interfere with the self-governing colonies. If they did they would, as British Columbia has indicated, soon cease to be colonies. All this, of course, has its reactions in India. I shall not soon forget the scene at a luncheon of distinguished Indians on the day that the famous Hardinge message on the South African question was published. That message had been assailed in the press as a grave indiscretion. As a matter of fact it carried off the electricity at a dangerous moment. I doubt whether the Indian Viceroy was ever, even momentarily so popular.

I must leave other aspects of the Imperial question, such as that of the attitude of Australia, and New Zealand towards the ally of Britain in the Far East. Let us turn back to the *Komagata Maru*. It will return to Asia with its load of Hindus, but the questions it has raised will remain to trouble the future. The Asiatic challenge to the white world will become more insistent and more formidable as the economic pressure of the massed millions of the continent increases as the demand of the coloured man for a place in the sun takes shape and impetus. In the face of that demand the white man will have two tasks which are not easily reconcilable. He will have to protect his civilization, not merely because it is his but because with all its faults, it is the most humane instrument that has been evolved for the advancement of men. And at the same time he will have to drop that spirit of arrogant contempt towards the coloured races which leads him for example, to cut up Africa as if it were his own background, take away the rights of the natives in the soil, and then tax them into the mines or exploit them in the rubber forests.

The following cable received by me on the 21st of July shows the end of the *Komagata Maru* enterprises:—

“Unsuccessful attack by four hundred armed Police on *Komagata* passengers yesterday how many hindustanees dead

and wounded unknown regular armed force thousand ordered to butcher unarmed men on board."

As soon as I received the cablegram I forwarded it to Mr. Charles Roberts the Under Secretary for India with a request to him to take suitable action. On the 28th July I received the following reply which practically closed the incident for the time being:—

"Dear Sir,

I have your letter enclosing a cablegram about the affair of the *Komagata Maru*. I am glad to see it, though I think it represents the apprehensions of those on shore rather than a statement of what actually occurred. As you doubtless know, the matter ended without bloodshed, and, so far as we know, no passengers were killed or seriously hurt, and the Canadian Government at all events supplied provisions.

If you have any further information about this grave affair, beyond what is contained in the cablegram, I should be very glad to see it. I return the cablegram."

CHAPTER FOUR

The Great War and Indian Loyalty

The Fabian Society of Great Britain organises a summer school every summer at which the various sections of the socialist party exchange views on various topics affecting the progress of the world and Socialism. A healthy locality is fixed where quarters are engaged and let to members and visitors on moderate prices. In 1914 at the instance and invitation of the Webbs,¹ Babu Bhupendra Nath Basu and myself attended the session of the Summer School which was held in the English lake district on a beautiful spot. The last 10 days of July were spent in a delightful communion with the best socialist workers and thinkers of England. Amongst those who attended the school and made speeches and took part in the debates were Mr. and Mrs. Webb, Mr. Bernard Shaw,² Mr. G.D.H. Cole³ and Mr. Babbit. There were others whose names I do not remember. The younger generation headed by Cole rose in revolt. They criticised, attacked and ridiculed the Webbs freely, but the latter never lost their temper and met all

¹Sidney James Webb, b. 1859, social reformer and historian; a Civil Servant 1878-91; joined Fabian Society 1885; founded *New statesman*, a newspaper in 1913; M.P. for Seaham Division of Durham 1922-29; Secretary for dominions and Colonies 1929-31; d. 1947.

²George Bernard Shaw, b. 1856; poet and writer; d. 1950.

³George Douglas Howard Cole, b. 1889; active member of Fabian Society; journalist; wrote several books; d. 1942.

attacks and criticism in good humour. Babu Bhupendra Nath Basu made a speech on India, of the usual 'appeal' type. On the whole, I enjoyed my stay in the lake district immensely. It provided me relaxation and instruction.

My attitude towards the War

Before leaving London for the Summer School I had made all arrangements for a tour on the continent en route to India. It was my intention to visit France, Germany, Switzerland, Austria, the Balkans, Turkey and Egypt. Several friends including the Webbs had given me letters of introduction for prominent people in these countries who could help me in the study of conditions there. It was my intention to leave England on or before the first of August. I returned to London on the 30th July and found the air full of war fears. Travelling agencies would not advise my going to the continent unless and until it was known that was going to happen on the first of August. The war had been formally declared by Austria and Germany. The country and the press were full of discussion as to whether England should join or not. Opinion was divided. The Tories were all for joining and the socialists against. The liberals were divided. At last England announced its decision to take the side of France and immediately the country was thrown into a state of turmoil.⁴ There was hustle and bustle on all sides. The attitude of the Indians, then in England showed to me for the first time in my life, practically and concretely, how foreign rule leads to a complete deterioration of the mainly virtues even amongst the best men of the subject race. I saw a most telling picture of hypocrisy and cowardice all round. I will explain what I mean. My first impression of the Indian mind on the announcement of the war was one of positive pleasure and relief. Everywhere you met the Indians, you found them giggling over the difficulties in which England found itself. They were happy that after all their opportunity had come. Now, the British would have to conciliate them. Within 24 hours of the decision of the Cabinet, I met a number of Indians sitting in the smoking room of the N.L.C. and talking of the war as if it were an occasion for jubilation.

⁴On August 4, 1914, Britain declared war on Germany.

This group included some of the highest placed Indians, Hindus and as well as Musalmans. Their mirth and jubilation became so immensely embarrassing that Mr. Jinnath had to rebuke them for their indecent behaviour, considering that the English members of the club were so gloomy and anxious about the situation. Within 24 hours from then the whole situation changed. All the leading Indians, including the men present at the Club on the previous occasion, began a competitive race in which each tried to outbid the others in expressions of loyalty and devotion to the Empire with a desire to take the credit of having given the lead.

One of these days I happened to go to the rooms of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress and there found two of my colleagues, members of the Congress delegation, discussing whether they should issue a statement of loyalty on behalf of the Congress.

They had seen high British statesmen and the latter had advised them to do so without loss of time. The only thing that disturbed them was the apprehension that I might not join them. So the moment they saw me they opened the attack. They wanted to issue a statement then and there, as we three formed the majority and the others they assumed would willingly sign. However, as expected, they found a tough customer in me. I objected to their proposal on various grounds: (i) No formal meeting of the delegation was called to consider the question. (2) The delegation was defunct having finished its work and dissolved itself formally after the rejection of the Bill. (3) The Indian leaders at home had not expressed their minds and sent us instructions. My colleagues were angry at my obstructive opposition. One of them called me names and some hot words passed between me and him. Eventually it was discovered that at least one other delegate was available at the National Liberal Club and could be sent for. This was done. So the matter had to be postponed. It was resolved to call a formal meeting of the delegates the next morning giving notice to the 5th member who was absent. The next day the formal meeting was held and it was decided by majority of votes that there was no hurry and we should wait for the news from India.

In the meantime, the other Indians started a movement to

get a general declaration signed by all prominent Indians then present in London. Sir M. Bhawanagree⁵ and Pandit Bhagwan Din Dube⁶ were the two principal sponsors of this movement. The defeated delegates of the Indian National Congress took their appeal to Sir W. Wedderburn who was then at Meredith and brought down a draft of a statement prepared by him for them. The first news of this statement I got was from the columns of the *Times* wherein the text of statement was published with a note that all the delegates including myself had signed it. It seems that some one put in my signature in the belief that I would, as a matter of course, accept a draft made by Sir W. Wedderburn. My signature on the statement was considered essential. On the 7th August I received the following wire from Pandit Bhagwan Din Dube:—

“Letter to Lord Crewe assuring our loyalty signed by elderly Indians including delegates, if you wish sign come immediately 3 Middle Temple Lane.”

I did not go to the rooms of Pandit Dube to sign the statement but a day or two later I did sign it at the National Liberal Club. Mine was perhaps the last signature. So I was definitely committed to a policy of loyal co-operation in the interests of the Empire. The news from India was even more disconcerting. Almost all the nationalist leaders joined in declarations of loyalty and devotion to the Empire. In the Viceroy's Legislative Council a resolution was unanimously passed that all the expenses of the Indian Contingent then and during the war would be borne by the Indian Exchequer. The British public, parliament and Press were naturally full of India and Indian loyalty.

On September 10 *The Times* published a letter from Sir Valentine Chirol⁷ in which he pointed out that the war had

⁵Sir Mancherji Merwanji Bhowanagari, b. 1851; son of distinguished Parsi merchant; began his life as a journalist; State agent in Bombay for the Bhaunager Raja 1879; MP for Bethnal Green 1895; was made K.C.I.E.

⁶Pt. Bhagwan Din Dube of Allahabad was then practising Law in London.

⁷B. 1852; traveller; journalist and author; incharge of *The Times* foreign department 1896-1912; visited India seventeen times; member of the Royal Commission on Indian Public Services 1912-14; d. 1929.

proved that the educated leaders had no real influence with the princes and people of India. That even they did not want the disappearance of the British *Raj*. In the same issue appeared a letter signed by Babu Bhupendra Nath Basu which ran as follows:—

As an Indian who came over to this country only temporarily as a delegate of the Indian National Congress, I read this morning the message of our beloved Viceroy of India's loyalty and India's cooperation in this great crisis of our life with tears in my eyes. Our Indian sun stirs our blood to strong emotions.

We feel grateful to Mr. Bonar Law⁸ for his suggestion that this message should be published to the world, and may I add that Indian women have not only cheerfully parted with their sons, husbands, and brothers at the call of the King, but I have received communications from India that many of them who are too humble to make their offer to the Viceroy are willing, if need be, to part with their personal jewellery and ornaments, things which in India constitute the women's insurance fund, as they did in by gone times when religion or honour was in danger.

Yours faithfully,
BHUPENDRANATH BASU.

One Frank Swetenham⁹ writing to the *Times* observed:—

“When Sir Valentine Chirol writes about India the rest of us may well accept the teaching of his great knowledge and experience. With reference to his admirable letter in the “*Times*” of September 12, I should like to ask him whether the magnificent proof in Indian loyalty and devotion to the Empire's cause may not rigidly be traced to the fact that the voice of India which speaks to-day is the real voice of the 300,000,000 of the great Peninsula, while the voice we are accustomed to hear is that of a comparatively small section of professional talkers,

⁸Andrew Bonard Law, b. 1858; Tory statesman; leader of the opposition in the House of Commons 1911-15; Prime Minister 1922-3; d. 1923.

⁹B. 1884; published several books; novel, and critical biographies; chief reviewer of fiction for the *London Observer*.

whose occupation has disappeared in the face of mighty issues which are moving the real heart of the people."

Even the *Manchester Guardian* wrote:—

"In the case of India it is undoubtedly the best proof which could be offered of the recognition by the Indian races of the unselfishness of British Rule, because on the whole all who leave this country to take part in the Government of our Eastern empire, from the Viceroy to the humblest official, are inspired by a tradition of duty not to exploit India for the good of this country, but to rule it for the good of the people. The fact that this is so clearly understood today, from the Himalays to Cape Cormorin, is the proudest tribute ever paid to the good faith of a ruling race."

Sir Pherozechah Mehta¹⁰ in the course of a speech delivered in Bombay said:—

"At this juncture of supreme gravity, we have met together here to-day, men of different races and religions, English, Hindu, Parsee, and Mussulman, to proclaim with one heart, one soul, and one mind that these differences distinguish but do not divide us, and that in the presence of this solemn situation we are merged in one general and universal denomination, the proud denomination of loyal and devoted subjects of the British Crown."

This speech was widely quoted and referred to in the English press. The *Daily Mail* in its issue of 10th September and under the caption, "A day worth living for", remarked:—

"The King's stirring proclamation to his Empire thanking the Dominions for the splendid energy with which they rallied to the cause of freedom, and the Viceroy of India's thrilling account of the magnificent outburst of loyalty among the Indian princes and the people will be read wherever English is spoken with emotions too deep for words and with gratitude that no language can express. This is the answer to the German militarists who told the world that the British Empire in India was a house built upon the sand, which would collapse in utter ruin at the first shock of war...The days though which we are living are glorious indeed beyond imagination and hope. The

¹⁰B. 1845; barrister of the Bombay High Court; President of the Indian National Congress 1890; d. 1915.

action of India touches us the more deeply because it comes from peoples that are not bound to us by ties of blood. It is a proof that the British Empire has a spiritual existence which neither distance nor time nor climate nor colour can destroy, and that it represents ideals for which all its citizens are prepared to live and die. It is also the final justification of our work in India and the reward for all those thousands of our countrymen who in the part have patiently toiled and laboured, fallen by the way, or returned broken with fever and heat from that far off 'land of regrets'. They builded better than they knew when they dedicated life to what many of our critics believed a vain and thankless task, with no object but to do what they believed to be right. For it has been our glory that in India we rested our power on other sanctions than those of force. We have striven to prepare a vast Empire of subject peoples to govern themselves, and we have tried to care for justice and loving kindness more than for mastery, for honour than for material gain. Now we know that it has not been in vain when we have such evidence of Indian loyalty and love."

Now all this was extremely embarrassing to those of us who had been proclaiming from house tops that British rule in India was unnatural, unjust and unrighteous and that India was being economically bled white by the policy of "drain". This "outburst" of loyalty was thrown at our faces as a complete answer to our statements against British rule. Under the circumstances I asked the permission of the Webbs to write an article on 'India and the War' for the *New Statesman*. They naturally wanted to see the article. When the article reached the editor he declined to publish it as it breathed sentiments of 'disloyalty' towards England.

So I wrote another article, which, on the recommendation of the Webbs, was accepted. It ran as follows:—

It is now clear, beyond a shadow of doubt, that the war is not going to be limited to Europe; its consequences will be world-wide. This no longer depends on Turkey and Greece joining the combatants, with consequences in Egypt and Arabia; the step taken by Japan in giving an ultimatum to Germany threatens to carry the war also to the other end of Asia. Whatever may be the result to the parties, it is apparent that when at last the war comes to an end, not only the map of

Europe but practically that of the whole world is going to be recast. With three continents—Europe, Asia and Africa engaged in the carnage, and the conflagration threatening to be world-wide, one sudders to think of its after effects. England, some say, is determined that this war shall be the last of its kind, and it must end the military despotism represented by both Germany and Russia. This war, such writers continue, is in support of the smaller nationalities, and in vindication of the liberties of the people, as against militarists, and against capitalists interested in the manufacture of armaments. So far good, but one is rather sorry to observe that these eminent thinkers and publicists who are discussing the future always exclude Asia, with its teeming millions, and Africa with its huge coloured population, from their calculations. It is obvious that all Asia cannot remain for ever contented with the position of subordination which it at present occupies. The Russo-Japanese war stirred Asia to its depths, and this war is going to stir it still further. Japan and China are apparently going to play a part in the coming events; and although the voice of discontent, and what is called sedition, has for the time been hushed in India, that country is very far from being satisfied with the condition of things that prevails within the boundaries or with the treatment that it receives from the British Government. Every one who has watched events in India knows that there is a great deal of real discontent there, and unless the British handle the situation in a spirit of liberal statesmanship, and make large political concessions, the situation might easily and rapidly grow very grave. The news from India indicates that she is prepared to stand by the Empire wholeheartedly in this crisis.

There is no fear of any complications arising. But this does not justify our concluding that India forgets her grievances against the English Government. What the present attitude of the Indians establishes is that they will stand by the Empire in any quarrel that England may have with other European powers. The only other European powers with ambitions towards India are Russia and Germany. Russia the Indians hate, and for Germany they have no love. What the Indians aspire to is political independence—not an exchange of masters. They would rather keep their connexion with the British

Empire, and would prefer to remain in it, if only they could be allowed to share in the privileges of its membership, instead of continuing in their present dependent position. Their readiness to help England in this crisis with men and resources shows that they are prepared to share the responsibilities of the Empire. In fact, the burden of Empire has always fallen on them in a greater proportion than on the other overseas Dominions of his Majesty. It is only of recent years that the self-governing Colonies have given evidence of their sense of responsibility for the safety of the Empire against European enemies. Even now, if properly analysed, their offers and services cannot be compared with those made by India. I do not desire in any way to under-estimate the colonial offers of help to the mother country in this crisis, nor do I say this in any carping spirit. My object is to emphasise the value of India to the mother country as the most important part of its Empire. It need not be repeated that without India, the British Empire would be a much feebler affair. My object then is to invite attention to the necessity of considering the needs of Asia and more particularly the claims of India, if it is desired to establish permanent peace. There can be no durable peace in the world unless the civilised west puts into practice its profession of liberty, humanity, and fraternity, not only in Europe but throughout the whole world. It may be that the different parts of the world require different treatment, but the object should be to put an end everywhere not only to military but also to political despotism, and to give relief to all who suffer therefrom. If it is realised (and not to realise this will be tantamount to a deliberate shutting of the eyes) that Asia cannot remain contented with a position of political subjection, then no settlement can be final which keeps her political aspirations out of calculation. If it is desirable to put an end to wars among the European nations, it is equally desirable that efforts should be made to remove the chances of any conflict between Europe and Asia shall in future be those of sisters engaged in the common service of humanity, and not those of exploiters and exploited. Coming back to India, I believe that the expressions of loyalty to the Empire made in England and in India are sincere, as far as present feeling goes, but I hope that British statesman and the British people will not construe them

as representing an absolute condition of the Indian mind. In the near past we have had ample evidence of the strong feelings of the Mohammendans of India, and it is doubtful what their sentiments would be if the Sultan of Turkey were to enter the arena as an ally of Germany. Similarly the offers by native chiefs do not mean very much. Most of them, as we know, are entirely in the hands of their British Residents, and are actuated by motives not necessarily identical with wholehearted loyalty to the British. As regards the Hindus we must not forget that there is still a party of violence among the Indian nationalists and that even the Indian National Congress itself pretty strongly about the Indian grievances against the British Government. The *Komagata Maru* incident must be still fresh in their memories. Expressions of loyalty from India must therefore be taken with a pinch of salt—not that one underrates their importance, or doubts their sincerity as against the other. European powers with whom we are engaged in war, but just to remind the British public that there is an Indian problem which must imperatively be considered when, after the war is over, we sit down to recast the political map of the world, and to readjust the political relations of the different races and nationalities of the world. Nay, I go a step further, and say that it would be a fine stroke of policy if the authorities were at this moment to do something to strike the imagination of the people of India, and to convince them beyond a shadow of doubt that the British do value their loyalty and really respect their desire to be citizens of the Empire.

Now the best and the most effective way to win the genuine and permanent loyalty of India would be to remove the galling bonds that remind her sons every moment their lives that they are the subjects of an alien Government, and that they have no status in the Empire to which they are expected to be loyal. What we have to do is by one bold stroke, to convert the loyalty of impotence or of fear into the loyalty of heart. This is no time to raise controversial issues. But no one can doubt that an enforced disarming of a population is a vivid and forgotten sign of its being a subject people. It is a never-healing sore. There can be no justification for such a measure except on the ground of self-defence. If so, it should not go beyond that. In Asia in particular, the fact of legal ineligibility

to bear arms carries with it such a sense of humiliation, helplessness, and self-contempt, that before it all other blessings dwindle into insignificance. In moments of danger or attack in a crisis like the present to feel that one is not legally permitted to defend oneself, one's hearth and home and one's people, that one is not allowed to fight for the kind or for the flag, that one has been by policemen forcibly deprived of the means of defending the honour of one's family and one's country makes one extremely miserable, and completely drowns the sense of other benefits received at the hands of those who have created this state of legally inflicted helplessness. Let Englishmen put themselves in the position of Indians, and then judge how they would feel under similar circumstances. Moreover, the disarming of a population is the most conclusive evidence that the disarming power realises that it cannot trust the people, and has no faith in their loyalty.

The first thing then is to remove this stigma. It may not be practical politics to repeal the Arms Act at once, but there ought now to be no difficulty in beginning by exempting men of position and education from the operation of the Act, or by making the issue to them of licences to bear arms a matter of course. Such a declaration would have a thrilling effect, and would raise a wave of loyalty which no amount of seditious propaganda could counteract. Dacoits, robbers, thieves and those who want to commit murder, can get arms even now. They are, it is true, obtained with difficulty, but for such people price is no consideration, nor have they any moral scruples against stealing arms whenever they need them. Let the British Government allow arms to good and honest citizens, and it will find a great load taken off its shoulders. Bombs will disappear, and with them we may hope, sedition and trials for sedition. Any kind of a European or American in India, even Germans and Austrians and Mexicans and Russians, can carry arms without a licence, but the wealthiest Indian and the most scholarly may not do so. If the latter be disposed to evil, he can buy a weapon at an enormous price from some needy European, or he can steal it; but if he wants it for the purpose of defending himself and his family, he cannot get it honestly. Under the circumstances what does the flag mean to him? How can he possibly be enthusiastic in his loyalty to a Government

which has reduced him to the level of a helpless beast? The devotion of Indians to the Empire is the devotion of helpless people, of dummies, of men who themselves, require to be looked after and protected by British bayonets in times of danger.

The next thing which would evoke a genuine feelings of loyalty in India would be a declaration to establish, as rapidly as possible, universal free and compulsory primary education at the cost of the State. Let it be no longer delayed by false reasons and false fears.

A third point, necessarily connected with the first, would be to allow Indians to enlist as volunteers both in England and in India. In England there is no restriction upon the carrying of arms, and the only difficulty is the possible prejudice of the England people against having coloured men as comrades. This should not be insurmountable. But there is another way out of any such difficulty, and that is to let the Indians from themselves into entirely separate volunteer corps, under the control and command of British Officers.

For the present these three suggestions will suffice. There are others that will occur to the authorities themselves. My object is to show the supreme importance and the need of holding out an olive branch to India, and of making India feel that her interests and her aspirations are as dear to England as those of England are to India.

Sir W. Wedderburn who was far more anxious about India than even the Indians themselves, followed up my article with a long letter endorsing my suggestions. On the 19th August I received the following letter from him:—

“I have been thinking over what you told me the other morning, and it appears to me very desirable that the points you mentioned should be brought before the British public.”

“As you were doubtful as to the expediency of putting forward the case in your own name, it occurs to me that I might in a letter by the *Westminister* or *New Statesmen* (whichever you prefer) giving your views, as being those of “A well-informed Indian friend who wishes well to the British Government.” If you think this a good plan, please send the copy of the letter you addressed to the *Westminister*, and I will then prepare a draft which I will send for your approval.”

On the 27th he wrote to me again saying:

"I have found Prussian bureaucracy more enlightened and more human than the British bureaucracy in India. Now whatever else India may be fighting for, it is neither in the interests of European freedom nor against German 'Militarism'. An Englishman can make out a case for himself. He is fighting for existence itself against the Welttraum of the Germans. That is quite reasonable, and appears to an outsider the strongest argument on the side of the allies. But what of the Indian? If this war is really, as has been suggested by the Poet Laureate, a war between Satan and Christ, which side is the Indian fighting for, since he believes in neither? This aspect of things has struck more thinking Englishmen who have been in touch with Indian affairs. Another answer has thus been suggested: India is fighting for the Empire.

"Let us estimate this interesting statement. Sir Frank Swettenham, in a letter of characteristic Anglo-Indian gaucherie in the *Times* said that he was confirmed in his comfortable conviction that the Indian discontent was a mere figment, that the days of the wordy politician were over and that India has been and ever will be true to England. He reads in India's loyalty the gratitude of those dumb millions who, strangely enough, Anglo-Indians always find vociferous in their praises. No more mistaken or gratuitous reading of the situation was possible, and its contradiction by Mr. MacCallum Scott¹¹ in Parliament was both fine and timely. Sir Valentine Chirol, another alleged authority on Indian subjects and one of that fascinating body of English public men who are most intimate with Anglo-India and therefore claim to speak with the utmost detachment about it, also wrote to *Times* saying that the support of England has come from those who had not been educated in the Western way the latter being always contemptible in Anglo-Indian eyes, being the products of their own education and that it went to show the British Government there was broad-based upon the people's will. I am afraid that after the war is over this is

¹¹Alexander MacCallum Scott, b. 1874; engaged in journalistic and political work in London; member of Lewisham Borough Council, 1903-6; member of the Speaker's Committee on Electoral Reform, 1916-17; joined Labour Party 1924; d. 1928.

likely to be the view of the bureaucratic element here, and those who, like our Indian National-Congress "leaders" imagine that they will find a grateful England acquiescing in their demands for a real participation in the Government of India are cherishing a fond illusion. It is therefore necessary to state that Young India thinks as to the real nature of this outburst of Indian loyalty.

"On the continent of Europe we are still accepted as equals, natural curiosity sometimes provoking an even excessive and embarrassing geniality. But the spirit of the Anglo-Indians is restive. The entente cordiale has enabled them, through the French Press, to spread an atmosphere of hostility and contempt towards our students at the Sorbonne. We are also convinced that the larger amount of political liberty extended to us recently has been due to the presence of a strong rival of England in Europe. But inspite of all this, in spite of the fact that we have been treated with such courtesy by the Germans, who are the most patient and most loving students of our culture. India is sending her sons to Europe. She is making a final and tremendous appeal to young heart and your imagination. She is appealing for a wider and a larger life in her own house.

Anglo-Indian bureaucrats, who have insulted Indians, trampled on their susceptibilities, discouraged their enthusiasms, chilled their hopes, and retarded their progress, now come forward to claim that India is fighting for the Empire, which they have created. India is not fighting for the Empire. She is not fighting for the Empire which has denied admission to her sons in Canada, to the unpopulated wastes of Australia, which excludes them from Natal which they have themselves practically built. India is sending her troops not to fight for the system of Government which has refused high posts to Indians in the administration, which has denied commissions in the Army to brave Indians who have shed their blood for England, which has imposed humiliating disabilities on them in universities and hospitals and engineering institutions throughout the Empire, which has made life impossible for the sensitive and the cultured among them, which has given shadowy political advantages, which has raised the unworthy and the sycophant to power, which has opposed the spread of

education to the masses, which has divided and ruled, which has spent untold gold on tawdry shows when millions of people were hungry with famine. India is not fighting for this order of things. Let it be clearly understood that she is not fighting against German "militarism" and in favour of Anglo-Indian or Anglo-Egyptian militarism—with the Zabern affair the East can compare the Denshawal—she is not fighting for the Empire as it is in spite of the copious tears which Mr. Basu, an Indian leader, has been shedding in the English press; she is fighting for a just and honourable and equal place in the Empire consistent with her dignity and her immortal traditions. Young India sees in Indian loyalty this purpose. She refuses to believe that the Indian troops now fighting for the Allies are mere mercenaries battling for no purpose, led by princes greedy of cheap governmental decorations, fighting their masters' fight—the savage hordes from the East employed to crush out German culture from Europe. For such they would be if their were not a definite ideal informing them for which alone they would be prepared to risk their lives.

"It is necessary that people should realise this fact at the time when the excitement of war is making them lose their sense of proportion, when underamt-of meaning are being read into obvious facts, when the word Empire is apt to shed a bean of justification on the obese countenances of retired bureaucrats."

"AN OXFORD INDIAN"

CHAPTER FIVE

The Indian Student in England

In the early part of my public career I was more of an educationalist and a social reformer than a politician. In all my trips to the west I was inspired by the desire of studying the educational methods of the west with a view to their application to India. In 1905, 1908-1909 and 1910 I did a great deal of work in this connexion not only in England but even in the U.S.A. and Germany, and on my return to my native country laid the result of my investigations and study before my countrymen. In the word education, I believed and still believe, is summed up the whole problem of India. Give me the control of the education department and fund necessary to work up my ideas and I could guarantee to you the political emancipation of the country within the life-time of one generation. I was thus vitally interested in the question of the Indian student in England and wanted to do as much for them as I could.' The *New Statesman* which is an out and out reactionary Imperialist paper now, was then under the direction and control of the Webbs. At their suggestion the then Editor agreed to accept a few articles from me on various Indian subjects. One of the subjects on which I wrote was the problem of the Indian student. After fourteen years (1928) I find the problem still unsolved and almost at the same stage now as it was then. In certain respects the position of the Indian students in England has even become worse. The prejudice against the Indian student in England has increased almost ten-

fold. Several I.M.S. officers have told me that the English doctors are very reluctant to help them in any way, in the hospitals or in the colleges. They pay the fees but they do not get the return. In India itself no arrangements exist for the highest class of medical study and research or for the matter of that many other branch of human knowledge. While the cost of administration has gone up by crores, the higher class of Indian students have still to go abroad to complete their studies. Education now, they say, is a transferred subject, but the money by which alone it is possible to disseminate as well as improve educational and research facilities is still in the pockets of the Finance Members of the various governments. As a piece of history I re-produce my article below:—

“The problem of the Indian students is growing more serious day by day. In a way, it is a part of the great problem of India, but in another way it is a problem by itself. It is as serious in India as in England, as it has been found that even at home the Indian student is not so docile and easily managed as he used to be.

There are three aspects of this problem—educational, economic and political. Educationally India is far behind the other civilised countries of the world. The Government of India have not yet accepted their obligation to establish a system of universal compulsory elementary education. The amount spent on secondary education, on universities, and on technical and industrial education cannot bear comparison with similar expenditure incurred for the same purposes by other Governments in Great Britain, in Germany, in France, in the United States of America, or even in Japan. Thus India is at double disadvantage. It not only suffers from want of schools and colleges and technical institutions but it also suffers from the quality of the education imparted in its educational institutions. Again, the government of India must not employ a large number of Europeans in the Educational service than is absolutely necessary. More often than not the persons appointed to, or selected for, the Indian Educational service are not of the best kind. It would be much better if a few first class men were appointed in every university than that a large number should be employed on salaries which cannot and do not attract first class men. The worst is that

even first class Indians are passed over in favour of the third class Europeans. Again, the Indian educational policy insists on a great deal of the Indian student's time being wasted on high proficiency in the English language and also on teaching all subjects, other than Oriental languages, in English. It also insists on impossibly high standards for ordinary passes. Add to this the fact that the education imparted is generally so unpractical that in many cases it does not enable the successful student to earn a decent livelihood at the end of his academic career. As far as Government service is concerned, the Indian educated in India must content himself with any inferior position however brilliant his university career may have been. This is the rule, though there are exceptions to it here and there.

The Indian Office Bureau

All these considerations necessitate the coming of a large number of Indian students to England, where again the colour prejudice has of late grown very largely both in volume and intensity, and it is very unfortunate that at the universities, the technical institutions, and the hospitals its growth should be *pari passu* with the establishment of the Indian Educational Bureau. The very establishment of this Bureau is an evidence that the Government is alive to the seriousness of the Indian students' problem in England. The Indian students in England are in revolt against the Bureau. Personally I would strongly favour an institution like his if it were worked in a purely educational spirit, with the sole object of helping the Indian students in getting educational facilities and practical experience. The Indian students however complain that it is not worked in that spirit; that, instead of removing the colour prejudice, it has contributed to the increase of it, by creating an atmosphere of distrust and suspicion; that from an advisory bureau it has developed into a department of administration, seeking to have an effective and exclusive control over all Indian students in Great Britain and Ireland, that, instead of securing greater facilities for Indian students, the working of the Bureau has resulted in the contraction of those facilities; that it is guided and governed more by political considerations than educational, and that it has introduced a regular system of

espionage, that its guardianship is quite ineffective and very expensive, and that it encourages flattery and hypocrisy, and doles out its favours in the same way and on the same principles which mostly guide the different departments of the Government of India in the distribution of patronage.

The Root of the Trouble

I am not in a position to say whether these complaints are well-founded, but I have no doubt that there must be something in them, and that the matter requires thorough investigation and a statesman like handling. The fact of the matter is that the whole educational policy of the Government in India is dominated by suspicion and distrust of the educated Indian, and that distrust and suspicion has by some unfortunate means travelled as far as England. I am prepared to admit that every Government is more or less moved by political considerations in the shaping of its educational policy. The difference is that in self governed countries the education of the citizen aims at making him not only an effective and useful member of the body politic, but also patriotic, self-reliant, and independent. In countries governed by bureaucracies such as that which rules India, one of the ideas that actuate the educational policy of the Government is to prolong the rule of the bureaucracy by discouraging all methods of education which might result in the lowering of their prestige, in the weakening of their hold over the people, and in the steady transfer of the power from the bureaucracy to the representatives of the people. This, of course, is bound to result in much educational waste, in educational contraction and distortion, and also in subordination of pure educational interests to political considerations. All this is the more accentuated when the ruling bureaucracy is foreign. The truth is that no foreign government can altogether be free from this prejudice. And if we recognise this fact, we cannot help remarking that great credit is due to the British government and the British nation for what they have actually done in India in the cause of education. It is evident, however, that with the political awakening in India the education problem enters on a new phase. It grows in complexity. There is suspicion and distrust on both sides. The Government mistrusts the Indian student

and the Indian student mistrusts the Government. It is time that something effective were done to remove this mistrust, as in any case the younger generation's growing in mistrust and suspicion of their Government is neither good for the Government nor for the country as large. Then, again, from the economic point of view also, the Indian student has some substantial grievances. He comes to this country at great sacrifice and receives the best education that he can get here. A good many of them distinguish themselves in the university examinations of this country; yet they find that there is hardly a career for them in their own country worthy of the education they have received and the expense they have incurred. A good many Indians who have qualified in the best technological institutes of Great Britain are passed over in favour of Englishmen whose educational qualifications are in no way better than theirs. All this makes them bitter and dour. Repressive measure might be effective so far as outward manifestations of discontent are concerned, but they can hardly lead to that contentment without which no government can ever be happy or fully secure. If the Government were once to make up their mind that their educational policy, both here and in India, will be solely guided by what is best for the Indian student, and that the successful Indian student will have the first claim to their patronage, then most of this distrust will disappear automatically.

In addition, early steps should be taken to make education in India as good and effective for all practical purposes as in England, so that the necessity for education in England might be dispensed with, at least in the case of a vast majority of those who came here either for competitive examinations or for admission into learned professions. The Educational Bureau in London should be purely advisory body and a help. The admission into English universities and hospitals should be free subject to the same regulations and restrictions as are imposed in the case of non-Indian students. Certificates of merit and a good conduct given by Indian colleges and universities ought to be quite sufficient for admission into British colleges, universities, polytechnics, and hospitals.

The Chimera of "Political Contagion"

The restrictions recently imposed on students in India with

a view to ensuring them against political "contagion" are in my humble opinion, futile and provocative. They have cut away the students altogether from political life. The authorities may well require that the students should not take active part in politics, but why remove them from influence which taught them the value of self-restraint in politicians, who alone could provide a proper atmosphere of political thought for them, for but have lost influence over the younger generation, as the latter have no occasion to mix with them fully and on intimate terms? The Indian student is a thinking being. No amount of repression can stop thought. The best and safest thing is to guide it and to allow it an outlet in proper and restrained channels. I am fully conscious of the fact that the Indian student in England sometimes goes wrong and requires guidance, but the remedial measure adopted have so far failed to improve matters. The gentlemen and ladies of the Educational Bureau mean well, but the circumstances under which they started their work rather unfortunate. Their work is uphill, as both their motives and their methods are questioned.

The real solution of the problem lies in opening careers for Indian young men and in bringing into existence conditions of political and economic life in India which may be consistent with individual as well as national self-respect. Let Indians have the same position in India as the Colonials enjoy in their colonies, or as Englishmen have in England, and the whole problem would be solved automatically. It cannot be done at once, at any rate let the government make substantial advances in that direction, so as to convince the Indian student and the Indian people that it intends to do it in the near future."

CHAPTER SIX

“Myself and the Indian Revolutionaries”

As soon as I reached the shores of America¹ I came into contact with all classes of my countrymen who were then in that country. With the exception of men who were directly or indirectly in the pay of the British Government I found all of them inspired by a high standard of patriotism. Most of them were extremists, only a few moderates. Among the former a large number were of the revolutionary type—some frank and open advocates of violence, others rather of a mild kind. The former were in alliance with Germany and were being supplied with money by German government agents. In New York, in Chicago, in Los Angeles, and in San Francisco I was asked by them to join their ranks but I declined to do so.² They told me only a little of their plans but what they did tell me was enough to convince me that they were contemplating and planning an armed insurrection in India, so timed as to be useful to Germany in her European

¹Lajpat Rai sailed from England on November 14 [1914] and reached New York City on the 21st.

²In his diary written in June 1919 Lajpat Rai recounts the activities of the Indian revolutionaries who were aiming to liberate India with the support of German arms and money and his relation with them. Some of the Indian revolutionaries who met Lajpat Rai in U.S.A. were Benoy Kumar Sarkar, Dr. Chandra Kanta Chakravarty, Heramba Lal Gupta, Ram Chandra. Dr. Khan Chand, K.K. Bose etc. See Lajpat Rai's Diary (N.A.I.).

campaign even if it failed as far as India was concerned. I had almost daily discussions with my countrymen on this point. They failed to convince me and I failed to convince them. They followed and shadowed me and used all their acts of persecution, but I was adamant. I refused to join them not because I loved the British or believed that their cause was righteous or that they (the British) were fighting for liberty of the world or that if they were victorious they would give India liberty. No, at no stage of the war and at no time did I believe in the bona fides of British declarations or British promises. But even by cold calculation I could not bring myself to believe that an alliance with Germany was likely to do us any good. I therefore resisted all attempts to involve me into this alliance and simply refused to be a party to any scheme of bringing about a revolution in India with the help of German money or German arms. I knew that outside the ranks of the army there were few Indians who could even wield an ordinary rifle or use even a revolver. What chance was there for the success of a revolution in India, even if (German arms) could be smuggled into India in sufficient quantities for the use of the revolutionaries?³

I was therefore opposed to all attempts of this kind. Yes I was no friend of English rule. I wanted to do anything in my power to expose British rule in India in the hope that

³Ram Chandra, leader of the Ghadr Party, made repeated endeavours to win Lajpat Rai's sympathy for the Government of Germany. In this connection Lajpat Rai writes: "He (Ram Chandra) told me a good many things about the German plans relating to India and as usual I ridiculed the possibility of their success. The most important thing he told me was about a projected cargo of arms and ammunition which was to be landed somewhere near Karachi. He said he had told them that hundreds and thousands of Indians would be there to receive arms and start a revolution at once. He was afraid lest there may be nobody there to receive arms and he might be discredited in the eyes of the Germans. I took him to task very severely for having practised deception upon his employers as he could not be ignorant of the fact that outside the ranks of the army, the whole of the Punjab and Karachi could not produce even 5,000 men who had ever seen a rifle, much less a machine gun. He admitted this and justified his conduct on the ground that was the only way to get German help." *Lajpat Rai's Diary* (N.A.I.).

when the final settlement came, such an exposure might be helpful to the cause of India.

There was another reason too for my refusal to join the Indian revolutionaries. Having no faith in the keen readiness of my country for an armed revolution I could only wish them to proceed on the lines of progressive nation-building. I had worked on these lines and I wanted to continue my work on the same lines. I was not ready for the role of an exile. I wanted to return to India. It was evident that any alliance with the Germans or with the Indian revolutionaries in open alliance with the Germans would render my return to India impossible. Whenever therefore I failed to convince my friends by arguments, I let them please themselves by calling me a coward.

"Benevolent Neutrality"

Yet I did not wish that any of my countrymen should come to harm simply because he was pursuing a line of action that did not commend itself to me. It was my duty to protect them by all means at my disposal. They respected and loved me. I admired and appreciated their patriotism. They were sure that under no circumstances could I betray them. At times therefore they sought my advice and I gave it willingly and freely but only to save them from injury in return most of them respected by benevolent neutrality and left me unmolested in work on my own lines.

But there were some who resented it and tried to entangle me. When I reached Japan a member of them were at Tokyo. Within a fortnight of my arrival there two of them met⁴ me purely by accident in a hotel at a summer resort. I had no personal acquaintance with either of them. But the name of one was familiar to me. The other was travelling under an assumed name. As soon as I read their names in the hotel register I was frightened and thought of leaving the hotel. One of them sent me word that he wanted to see me. I saw him and told him that I was leaving the hotel as I did not want my position to be misunderstood, He told me that they were leaving that very minute and so they did. This gentle-

⁴Bhagwan Singh and P.N. Thakur, both revolutionaries.

man again met me by appointment in Tokyo. We discussed the situation and came to an understanding that each would follow his course without his being molested by the other. I kept my part of the understanding but the other party did not.

Unwelcome Friends

Soon after, the Japanese Government—at the instance of the British Government—began to shadow him (Bhagwan Singh) at close quarters. Two of the Japanese police followed him day and night wherever he went. I knew that has started the Society, I want you to understand quently did not very much like the idea of receiving visits from him or from his open confederates. But one day the same gentleman deliberately and out of sheer spirit of mischief came to visit me. The two policemen were with him. They did not enter my compound but they were outside in front of the gate all the time. I begged of him not to embarrass me and it was with some difficulty that I persuaded him to leave me alone. A few days later it was announced that he had eluded his guardians and left the country. The other gentleman (P.N. Thakur), however, was still in the country and was soon after joined by another from America. Be it said to the credit of the former that he did not worry me, never came to my place and left me alone, though I met him sometimes at the house of a common friend, being for a fairly long time ignorant of his real name and personality. But the new arrival from America did not leave me alone. He insisted on seeing me occasionally. This gentleman was well supplied with money. He lived in style and earned the suspicion of the Japanese authorities.

Fuss About a Toast

He in collaboration with other Indians was organising an Indian banquet in honour of the coronation of the new Emperor of Japan, I was asked to preside. I accepted on two conditions. First that no Indian except myself would attempt to speak. Secondly, that no toasts would be proposed and no political speeches made. These conditions were accepted and the banquet came on November, 1915. It was a brilliant function and everything passed off just as was planned. One of

the Japanese guests touched on politics but as soon as it was pointed out to me by a Japanese professor of the Imperial University I stopped him. An English journalist commented on the function rather adversely in an English journal published in Tokyo. He noticed the absence of Union Jack and also that the toast of the King Emperor was not proposed. This was replied to by an Indian in a letter which appeared in the *Japan Advertiser* for December 30, 1915. It was pointed out in the letter that the banquet "was a purely social gathering", that "Mr. Rai was the sole speaker amongst the Indians. His speech was confined to general remarks on the friendship of India and Japan":

In the editorial article appearing in your issue of the 4th instant on the deported Indians, it is extremely regrettable that you have fallen into a number of fallacies entirely without any foundation. Your conclusion, too, that the Indians have done an act of disloyalty, is consequently both mischievous and fallacious.

Firstly, that "Mr. Lajpat Rai and his compatriots gave a banquet," is quite misleading. The banquet was given by the Hindustanee resident in Japan, some of whom were introduced to Lala Lajpat Rai only on that day. Mr. Rai was only requested by the gathering.

Next you fall into two greater fallacies in stating that the banquet was given to Japanese newspaper men for, besides Japanese and Indians, there were Americans and Englishmen, and besides newspaper men there were many leading educationists of this country. Practically all the leading Colleges of Tokyo were presented,

Last but not the least you have committed the great mistake in saying that "while the toast of the Emperor of Japan was drunk, there was none for the Emperor of India". In this connexion I may state that the function was purely oriental with the exception of the food itself. There were no toasts drunk at all. It was only a recollection of the ancient friendship and brotherly feeling between the Indians and Japanese and not between Japan and India. Though as a whole we are all British, Indians themselves are a distinct part."

This was admitted by the paper itself: "the decoration was solely of the Japanese flags"; that "no toast was proposed" and that "the banquet was attended by about 70 Japanese gentlemen two-thirds of whom were lending professors of the Universities while the others consisted of people holding high status in business, politics and society". All these statements were absolutely true.

As soon as the banquet was over the two Indian revolutionaries (both Bengali gentlemen)⁵ who had been chiefly responsible for that banquet were served with a notice to leave Japan within five days. Two police constables were deputed to watch and follow them all the 24 hours. This raised great indignation amongst Indians and Japanese both. Virtually the whole of the Japanese press condemned the order and denounced this violation of the right of asylum to political refugees so much honoured and respected by the European natives. A deputation of the leading Japanese journalists and other leading men waited on the head of police but he excused himself on the ground that the order had originated from the [Foreign] office. Count Okuma⁶, the Premier, who was sick and confined to his room at the time pleaded ignorance of the order and his inability to cancel it as it would imply humiliation of the Foreign Minister. So the Japanese politicians opposed to the order found out another way of saving the Indians affected by the order. On the eve of the last day, the Indians followed by the two constables went on a visit to one of the leading members of the Japanese Diet (Parliament). The men went inside but the police remained outside. After a while it was found out that the Indians had walked out of the house by another door and were missing. They were never arrested. One of them, after some time, returned to the United States, the other is still in Japan, married if my information is correct, to a respectable Japanese woman.

⁵H.L. Gupta and P.N. Thakur or Rash Behari Bose, the famous Indian revolutionary who was mainly responsible for throwing of bomb on Lord Hardinge in December 1912 at Delhi.

⁶B. 1838; Japanese statesman leader of the Progressive Party until 1907; minister of foreign affairs 1889-91, 1896-97; minister of agriculture and commerce 1897; Premier June-Nov. 1898, and 1914-16; d. 1922.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

The Congress Delegates and the Bill

Sir,—We, the Delegates of the Indian National Congress, were present in the House of Lords on Tuesday last (June 30) on the occasion of the debate on the second reading of the Council of India Bill.

We deeply regret that a motion was made for the rejection of the Bill.

The proposed measure embodies three important principles, namely, (i) statutory provision for including in the Council at least two Indians members; (2) selection by the Secretary of State of those Indian members from a list to be chosen by the non-official members of the different Legislative Councils of India; and (3) increasing the powers in certain matters of the Secretary of State.

It may be said that (1) and (2) represent the minimum amount of concession made to Indian public opinion, which insists on one-third of the members of the Council being Indians and elected by only the elected members of the Indian Legislative Councils. If even the minimum concession provided in the Bill is not accepted by the House of Lords, we consider that reference of the Bill to a Select Committee will be useless.

As regards (3) increasing the power of the Secretary of

Letter signed by the delegates of the Indian National Congress to the Editor, *India*, (London) published in the issue of July 3, 1914.

State, we see no objection to this point being considered by a Select Committee.

The rejection of the Bill will create a very unfortunate impression in our country, and will greatly weaken, if not paralyse, the constitutional party in India.

84, Palace Chambers,
Westminster, S.W.

BHUPENDRA NATH BASU,
M.A. JINNAH,
LAJPAT RAI,
N.M. SAMARTH,
B.N. SHARMA,
S. SINHA.

July 2, 1914.

(A)

The Danger of Rejecting the Bill

The Indian present in the House of Lords when the second meeting of the Indian Council Bill was moved by the Marquis of Crewe were not at all surprised at the line adopted by Lord Curzon about that measure. They expected nothing better from him. The opposition of Lord Curzon and his party to the Bill is extremely unfortunate. We Indians are sorry for it, because the rejection of this Bill is likely to reduce the confidence of the educated classes in India in the desire of Britain to be just to them and their political aspirations. Lord Curzon's viceroyal policy gave birth to the party of physical force in Indian nationalism, and his present action in moving the rejection of this Bill, and opposing even the qualified election of the Indian members of the Council provided for in the Bill, will most assuredly strengthen that party. We are sorry, not because we consider the measure to be of such supreme importance to India as to justify our building up very high hopes on it, but because the refusal of such a small concession to Indian public opinion as was made in the Bill will immensely weaken the cause of constitutional agitation in India.

The Opposition of the Constitutional Nationalist

The British Government in India have committed blunders in the past by ignoring the advice of the Constitutionalist

This letter of Lala Lajpat Rai was published both in the *Daily News* and the *Westminster Gazette*, London, on July 4, 1914.

Nationalist and by deferring hope; and I fear they are about to commit another blunder of a similar nature. It is time the British statesmen came to realise that events in India are marching rapidly, and that unless they regulate their future administration of the country in the light of this rapid march, the task of administering India is bound to grow, not only more and more difficult, but also risky. The Constitutional Party in India recognise these risks. No one, not even the all knowing civilian, is in a better position to know of the under-currents of political and social and religious life in Indian than they. No one is more opposed to sudden upheavals in India than they, and this is so because they believe that the best interests of their country may suffer thereby. But even they are powerless to stem the tide of indignation which is born of hopelessness and futile agitation for the recognition of their rights.

Lord Curzon and their bureaucrats played with a nation's sentiments. They branded them as liars and cowards. The younger generation lost their temper, and in spite of the best efforts of the Indian leaders to the contrary, resorted to measures of retaliation which no one deplores more than the Indian public man. Ever since then, the Indian Constitutional agitation has been at a discount. Distrusted by their own younger countrymen, distrusted and after looked down upon with suspicion and contempt by the rulers, the Indian Constitutional Nationalist has occupied an unenviable position. It is no wonder that he is often between the devil and the deep sea. The rejection of this Bill will add to his difficulties and possibly also to the difficulties of the Government. But, however much he may deplore it, he is helpless to do anything effective to change the situation.

The Effect on Indian Opinion

We are very much amazed when we heard Lord Curzon denouncing autocracy, and also the huge irresponsible expenditure of Indian money in England—the money of “the voiceless millions” of India. Yet Lord Curzon always opposes every effort which the Indians put forth to reduce the elements of autocracy in the Government of India, and also their claims to control, however slightly, the spending of Indian revenues both in India and England. It is conduct like this which leads the

Indians to question the sincerity of British statesmen whenever the latter talk of high principles in connexion with the Government of India. They know what has come out of the so called "expansion of the liberties of the people of India" by the reforms introduced by Lord Morley. The regulations practically took away what was given or meant to be given by the despatch or the statute. Many thoughtful people in India say that the British are past-masters in the art of giving with one hand and taking it back with the other—or posing to give what they do not intend to give.

May we hope that better counsels will prevail, and that lord Curzon will withdraw his opposition to that part of the Bill which provides for a very qualified and mutilated election of Indian members of the Council of India? We are perhaps hoping against hope.

(B)

**The Lords and A Listener—Lala
Lajpat Rai Describes the Debate**

The Council of India Bill is dead. The Tory party in the House of Lords made short work of it, though they spoilt a great deal of logic in doing so.

The fact is, the Bill satisfied nobody and evoked no enthusiasm. Even the speeches made in its support were half hearted. The Tories opposed it because it professed to introduce an element of election into the constitution of the Council, because it reduced the council in size, and because it gave enhanced powers to the Secretary of State. The Indians did not like it because it did not go sufficiently far to make their representation adequate and effective. Even the supporters of the Secretary of State were not sure about it, as they wished to refer it to a Select Committee. The delegates of the Indian National Congress were prepared to accept it as a first instalment of the intended reform, though they never concealed their disappointment at the inadequate representation of independent Indian opinion, and particularly at the proposed method of selection of Indian members. The expressions of adverse

opinion in certain Indian newspapers were made use of by the Tories in support of their own opposition to the Bill without an honest recognition of the grounds on which these opinions were based. The Indian (as distinguished from the Anglo-Indian) Press disapproved of the Bill because the concessions were so trifling. It failed to recognise that India is likely to fare even worse if the reform of the India Office is undertaken by the Tories. There can be no doubt, after the speeches made by the Tory Lords, that they intend to raise the question if and as soon as they return to power; and the Indians are not likely to get from them even as much as was conceded by this Bill.

On the other hand, the Liberal Government may be made wiser by the rejection of the Bill. There is not much use in doing things half-heartedly. If you decide to give, give ungrudgingly and magnanimously. When a small concession such as was made in the Bill now dead cannot be carried through Parliament it shakes Indian confidence in the British statesmanship. If the Govt. had conceived this Bill in a spirit of generous statesmanship it would have not only derived the Opposition of one of its chief weapons, but by evoking the gratitude of the Indian Community it would have aroused such an amount of enthusiasm in India as would have been difficult even for the Tories to ignore.

What amused us (The Indians who were present) most was the statement made by Lord Sydenham that there was no public opinion in India; and that the elective principle would be opposed by the bulk of the population! Public opinion in India has grown quite familiar with the trick often employed by reactionary ex-Governors of opposing the demands of the intellectual classes by saying that any advance towards popular government would be resented by the Chiefs of India. The Chiefs might be asked whether they preferred the rule of Lord Curzon; and what they think if the political agents who have been set over them, in several cases in violation of the treaties made with their predecessors in the early days. It passes one's comprehension what objection the Chiefs can be supposed to have to the election of the Indian members of the Secretary of State's Council by the elected members of the Indian Legislative Councils, and in what way can they be better served by nominated members.

But it is useless to grumble at sophistry not seeing its own fallacies. One Lord went so far as to say that what was wanted in the British administration of India was not sympathy but "justice and impartiality, thereby repudiating the gracious remark of his Majesty the King himself! Indian opinion, however would support him to the latter if it could be sure of getting "justice and impartiality" between Indians and Englishmen. Can a man who exploits others ever be just to the latter in the proper sense of the term? Why talk of "justice and impartiality"? Talk of might! One of the leading Tory organs in London has been more honest in this respect than any of the Lords who spoke on the Bills. In the course of a leading article discussing the provisions of the Bill and commenting on the selection of the Indian members from a partly elected panel, it remarked that after all India was won by the sword and must be held by the sword. This, in truth, is the view of the Tory party in a nutshell. No Indian would quarrel with it, however he may dislike it, if it were put frankly and honestly whenever there is a demand for a larger share in the government. Indian thinks better of those who speak the truth, even though it be distasteful. But to talk of justice, impartiality, of the good of India, and so on, is adding insult to injury, and it deceives no one.

The summary rejection of a small measure like this, introduced by a Government in power, is bound to make an unfortunate impression in India. I am of opinion that Indians would do better to agitate for the complete abolition of the Council than for its reform. It is a white elephant maintained at the cost of the Indian taxpayer. It is the strongest fortress of the bureaucracy. Unless it is destroyed there can be no hope of Indians getting any substantial voice in the management of their own affairs of their country—Yours etc.,

Lajpat Rai

APPENDIX II

Lajpat Rai & British Citizenship

A Greater Measure of Self-Government

Sir,—I wonder if Englishmen at home realise the full significance of the attempt of the Hindus aboard the *Kamagata Maru* to enter Western Columbia in exercise of their rights of British citizenship.

The first thing to note in connection therewith is that these Hindus are Sikhs, the descendants, compatriots and co-religionists of those who saved His Majesty's Eastern Empire in the time of England's greatest peril in India, viz, in 1857.

But for the loyalty and the bravery of the Sikhs, one shudders to think what the fate of the Empire would have been. Possibly, nay, probably that Empire would have been lost. Then the Sikhs have shed their blood for the Empire in Egypt, in the Soudan, in China, in Abyssinia, and in Burmah, and it is from their ranks that a considerable part of His Majesty's Indian Army is recruited. Some of your best generals have called them the "flower" of the Indian Army. They have been and are believed to be above the taint of sedition, and any educated Indian supposed to be agitating among them receives the severest (sometimes the most summary) punishment which is in the power of the Government of India to inflict. The mere suspicion of such a thing as agitation among the Sikhs raises the direct anger

Letter to the Editor, *The Daily News and Leader*, London, published in the issue of June 7, 1914. Lajpat Rai was in London at the time of writings.

of the British Official in the Punjab, and justifies the harshest measures of repression, such as were adopted in 1907. Yet here we are on the threshold of a great agitation among the Sikhs, the responsibility of which cannot be traced, even by a stretch of imagination, to any "agitator".

Equal Rights

The fact is that the British Government in India is on the horns of a dilemma. They want the Indians to believe that they are the equal subjects of the King, but when the former claim their rights as such, they behave as if they have neither the power nor the desire to secure the same for them. Perhaps it is not so much the fault of the Government in India as of those statesmen who have to reconcile their professions and principles of Liberalism with their policy of subjection. There is no half-way house between democracy and despotism. So long as India is governed from Whitehall and is not free to retaliate, the difficulty with which the Government is face to face in Canada will not be removed. The desire, the ambition, and the necessity of claiming the rights of British citizenship is no longer confined to educated Indians, but is permeating through the uneducated classes and even the masses.

The unlimited competition of the foreigner in the trade and service markets of India leaves them no other choice. The Indian labourer has so far been exploited for the benefit of the British Colonies under the most degrading and humiliating conditions. It has, however, done him one good: it has brought him the consciousness of his value as worker. But just when he awakes to this consciousness he finds that there is no room for him in the world. At home his wages are despicable, and he can hardly live a decent life on those wages. Even the Government sweats him; when permanently employed in Government offices his wages ordinarily ranged from 2s. a week to 4s. or 5s. a week. When skilled and educated, he finds that most of the good places are held by the foreigner. Every riff raff of a European, not to speak of British Colonials, has free admittance into India, and a large number of German, Italian, French, and American mechanics and engineers find employment in Government establishments and industrial concerns, while a great many skilled Indians, some of them educated in the best technical

institutions in India, England, and America remain unemployed, or have to be contented with very inferior positions. He thus suffers doubly. His country is open to the competition of the whole world, while he is debarred from admittance even into parts of the British dominions. Is it a wonder that he has begun to complain that if he had a Government of his own at his back, the world would not treat him thus? He feels helpless and friendless.

Power of Exclusion

To my mind, the remedy lies in giving a greater measure of self-government to India, with full powers of excluding foreign labour to the same extent and in the same way as the other parts of his Majesty's dominions do. Short of this, nothing is likely to avail much, and the trouble may continue to grow and embarrass both the Government and the Indian patriot, as it is no less embarrassing to the latter than to the farmer. It disturbs the Indian nation builder in his work, and puts an unspeakable strain on his loyalty and on his patriotism. It reduces his influence with the younger generation of his countrymen, and disables him from enforcing discipline and self restraint in public life.

The spectacle of 400 Sikhs taking to hunger strike in British Canadian waters is fraught with serious consequences, and is likely to have the most disastrous effect on Sikh loyalty. The telegrams from Canada show that some of them have already commenced talking bitterly. The retired Sikh soldiers already settled in Canada are also suffering under certain disabilities, the most important of which is imposed by the so-called "Continuation-journey Clause", which affectually debars their wives and children from entering Canada.

It is time, I think, for British statesmen to apply their minds seriously to the solution of the problem, or else the trouble may grow in gravity, and then it will be futile to blame the poor "agitator" for the consequences thereof.

(A)

Indian Immigrants—**Lajpat Rai and the Right of Entry**

Sir,—I hope you will let me say a few words more in continuation of my letter published in your issue of today,

Firstly, my suggestion of retaliatory powers does not meet the case of those Indians that are already settled in the different parts of the British Empire. It is absolutely necessary that justice and equality of treatment should be secured to them, and they, their wives and children, should have an unfettered right of ingress and egress, besides equality of treatment as British subjects in other respects in their adopted homes. A good many of them went to these Colonies for the benefit and on the invitation of the latter. Others went when there was no legal bar. Some of them hold property in these dominions and have married there. Some are the descendants of those that originally settled, and do not perhaps know their own language. Their modes of life and habits and manners have entirely changed, and if they were to return to their country they would feel very awkward. As for further immigration they claim the right of free entry as British citizens. If that right is not admitted they claim a right of retaliation. At present they are treated even more harshly than other Asiatics, who are not British subjects, as, for example, the Japanese and the Chinese. The "Continuation Journey Clause" does not affect these latter, as they have direct steamer services between their countries and Canada and so on. You can well understand how much bad feeling the consciousness of this inferior treatment creates in India, which is neither good for the Government nor for the people.

Second, what I mean by a "greater measure of self-government" is a sort of autonomous Government such as the Colonies enjoy, or in any case a form of government with a substantial Indian element in it elected by popular vote. I am not at all in favour of the control of White hall being removed or lessened so long as that condition is not fulfilled. That will be a remedy worse than the disease.

Letter to the Editor, *The Daily News and Leader*, London, published in the issue of June 10, 1914.

APPENDIX III

The Indian Point of View

An American Article by Lala Lajpat Rai

I have often been asked how India feels about the War, and what is her position. India's interest is neither purely altruistic nor absolutely disinterested. She is interested in the results of the war as she hopes for a radical readjustment of her political relations with England, or, for the matter of that, with the whole world. She aspires to a position worthy of her past. Her people desire to be in their own country what other people are in theirs, as it is only then that she can make her proper contribution to the world ethics and the world culture.

Readjustment and Revaluation

Then, again, this war must result not only in the revaluation of proper standards, but also in a revision of ethical and moral ideals. India has a valuable contribution to make toward this revaluation. This readjustment and revaluation must spring from a spirit of co-operation and goodwill, not only between the different nations of the world, but also between the different religions of the world. That is only possible if India is treated justly and generously and given her legitimate place in the comity of nations, and if her political disqualifications and disabilities are removed.

The Political Awakening

At present the world sees India with other than Indian eyes, and generally with the eyes of prejudice—the eyes of empire builders and empire rulers. She suffers a great deal from misrepresentation and misapprehension.

However, we need not unearth the past; what we are just now concern with is the present. There can be no denying the fact that ever since the Russo—Japanese war India has been astir. A keen desire for political liberties has been shown by all classes of her people. The general awakening of India has attracted world wide notice. A national party has come into existence who do not accept the present political arrangement as satisfactory or honourable. Some of them desire complete independents; others would be contented to remain within the British Empire on the same footing as Canada or Australia or South Africa. They have proved their fitness by every test recognised under the sun.

Indians as Fighters

It is now an established fact that even as fighters Indians are inferior to none. Many a position lost by the purely white troops in this war has been regained by the Indians. Their valour, their resourcefulness, their stamina, their indifference to death, their skill, have all been put to test. The unanimous opinion of all competent observers is in their favour. The British press and the French press, and even the German press, are full of praises for them. Yet they are fighting in strange environments, in a climate of which they have had no experience before, among people (both friends and foes) whose language they do not know.

The Grievance of the Arms Act

The fighting capacity of India is simply inexhaustible. India can throw into the war millions of fighting men, if they are properly armed. At present a General Arms Act prohibits the use of arms by Indians in general except under a licence from the magistrate, which is granted very sparingly, and for very strong reasons. Even the constitutional party among the Indian Nationalists feels the humiliation of being a disarmed nation strongly objects to a continuance of this policy. It demands the

repeal of this Act or such modification of its provisions as will enable the bulk of men of property and education to carry arms. When the war ends this demand is sure to gain in volume and intensity, and it will be impossible for the authorities to resist without creating a serious disaffection in the country.

The Indian "Intellectual"

As for intellectual equipment, their intellectual capacity has never been denied. But education is neither compulsory nor free. The population of 300,000,000 in an area of over a million square miles has only five universities to satisfy their craving for intellectual food. In the matter of scientific, technical, and vocational education, India is decades behind Europe and America. There is hardly a high-class technological institute, in the whole country. To get up to date education Indians have to go to Europe or seek the hospitality of American universities.

It is obvious that this can be done by few only, and sometimes the best of the Indian students cannot get proper education to enable them to show the best in them. Yet the few that have gone to Europe or have come to America have held their own against local students. In the British Universities, Indians have on many occasions beaten Britishers on their own ground; occupied the highest positions in all departments of knowledge, mathematics, classics, history, political economy, science, medicine, surgery, law, and philosophy. In India itself the opportunities for original and research work are almost nil. Post graduate work is very little provided for. Yet in less than fifty years the country has produced a Tagore and a Bose—one on the literary side and the other on the scientific.

As Lawyers and Statesmen

As for capacity for legal and political work, it is admitted by the British Administrators that the world knows no more keen and acute lawyers and clever debaters than the Indians. With the Indian press Act laying down limitations on the liberty of the press and with "sedition" laws always hanging over their heads like the sword of Damocles, the Indian politicians have held their own. There is no lack of statesmanship and public spirit in India if there were only fields for its display.

There is another part of national life in which India lags

decades behind the other big countries of the world, namely, on the industrial side. For some time it was said that Indians were lacking in enterprise and in commercial genius. The difficulty is that India is not free to determine and follow its fiscal policy. That policy is laid down for it from London, and the interests of Great Britain loom very large. Even if the Government of India, as at present constituted, were to determine a policy in the interests of India, primarily, they would not be allowed to do so if it in any way militated against the commercial interests of Great Britain.

What Self Government Will Do

With self-government the industrial regeneration of India will come as a matter of course. It will remove the present embargo on Indian immigration to other countries outside of Asia. Self-governed India will loom large in world politics, not as aggressor or exploiter, but as a contributor to the general happiness of mankind, and to the moral and ethical uplift of the race. Hindus are the most tolerate people on earth. With self-government gained India will be a great moral force. It will add to the glory of Great Britain if she gets it without bloodshed. She has deserved it by her conduct in the past. She is earning it now on the battlefields of Europe. She can be a never ending source of strength to the British Empire, if dealt with justly and liberally.

APPENDIX IV

Why India is in Revolt Against British Rule

Many Englishman are asking to-day, why in peace-loving India insurrection is extending now all over the country, while Britain is fighting for her very existence? Grievances, true, she has had many, but she of all contries should have remained true to her past ideals and been chivalrous enough not to have attacked England from her back.

Yes, if England would have practised what she has been preaching! Many an Indian in the beginning of the war listened to that sophistic argument and learned to his bitter experience it was but another tyrant's pretext. Perfidious Albion puts on a pious holy cloak and appeals to India's sense of religious honour, so that she lets slip this golden opportunity offered by the present European war, and when the war is over, all the momentum of the British Empire can be brought in operation to crush the hopes and aspirations of the Indian people for generations to come. But the hour has struck and destiny has decreed that India shall no longer be deceived and the dis-integration of the British Empire, based on treachery, perfidy and tyranny, is but the question of a day.

This pamphlet was written by Lala Lajpat Rai when he was in New York and was published by the Indian National Party, London, in 1916.

England has filled her cup to its bitterest full, and like auto-intoxication, she is dying by her own hands Whirlwind she has sown and must reap her harvest. This is the immutable law of *Karma*. Her tyranny and hypocrisy have generated the poison, and by its virulent toxin she has sealed her own doom. Mystic and peace-loving India has learned to hate England with that religious fervour and passion which transcends the soul and in which remains the only exquisite delight of revenge. To see England but humiliated and crushed would be as if to ascend the gates of heaven, and on her brow the stigma of slavery—as she has robbed others of their liberty, so she feels its pathos and pains for her own retribution.

That is why millions of Orientals today are praying for the success and victory of the German arms more ardently than the devout Christian prayed for the delivery of Jerusalem. Thousands are adding every day to the standard of revolt and painting the Eastern sky with the vermilion-red and with their martyr's blood, are cementing national unity and consciousness.

Out of gloomy despair and dark pessimism have come the undying hope and enthusiasm. The iron chains of slavery that bound them are being forged into the flaming sword of liberty and freedom.

Call it madness, if you please, or havoc of oriental emotionalism, for the unarmed masses to rise against modern artillery. But what else could they do? To cherish revenge only in heart, when seeing the country robbed and outraged by the worst kind of legalized piracy, and the best leaders, the hopes of the future, dragged into the dungeons;—to live that life of lingering torture, degradation and shame without a manly protest, would be a living grave. Rather death thousand times more enjoyable on a hangman's stand or sword in hand before the cannon's mouth, avenging the wrongs, than the vegetating life of meek submission to tyrant's haughty and disdainful threats. Through that death, life becomes a new invigorated spiritual force, as the embodiment of an ideal for others to guide, as long as the goal is not reached. This disembodied re-incarnated soul lives in thousands of others and inspires with the ideal, and death loses its terror—the tyrant loses his power.

That is what has been happening in India to-day. Death has entirely lost its terror for hundreds of thousands; it has

become rather an object of emulation and family pride, and prison for political offence a card of social esteem and recognition. And the British power is crumbling in its blood-soaked grave.

In the last decade of the nineteenth century, the English statesmen cleverly used to keep before the Indian people that if there were any revolution in India and the English power withdraw, the people would be trampled under the Russian heel; and the Indian people, though they had never any love or loyalty for the English, choose and lesser evil.

But this time India is disenchanted. The boggy of German invasion and oppression has had quite a different effect. The people took it at its worth. Those who were not convinced before, became finally convinced—what hypocrites the English could be. An honest enemy is more preferable than a seeming friend, with the hidden danger of a cut-throat, a serpent hidden in a flower.

England plunges into this world-war to defend the liberty of Belgium; her heart bleeds for the sufferings of its people—for its outraged women and oppressed children. India, the land of romance and chivalry, should help England with men and money, in her splendid mission to restore liberty in Europe and erect high again the temples of gods, sacrilegied by the German Barbarians. This appeal to these heathens for the defence of the Christian temples first thrilled the imagination of many, and many a heroic son responded to its martial calls, believing England might have seen her own mistakes and changed her policy and would willingly give to India her rightful dignified place in the Councils of Nations, as she has been promising for half a century. But soon they found out, it was another dirty but old and clever game of England. India has been fooled again, but England has lost for ever her magic spell over India.

Many went to fight England's battles in Europe. Very few returned; but those who returned told quite a different story. The soldiers of the past generation have been brought up with the conviction, from the memory of the first revolution of 1857, that the English are invincible as long as they hold the mastery of the sea, and better trained in science and organization than any other people. But their personal experience and observation

shattered their old belief. They found the Germans were superior to the English in everything—in trained knowledge and efficient organization—both in land and sea. The exploits of the “Emden” and the submarines, and the retreats on the Gallipoli, corroborated their conviction, and whatever doubt was left was removed. When the physical fear which kept them awed, was no more of pressing concern to them, as to the moral hesitation, there was none. The stories widely circulated in India, as to the spoliations of the temples and the outrages on Belgian women and children by the German Huns and that they would do just the same, in India—if they are not bitten, only provoked the mirth of the populace and England enmeshed herself in her own net.

Who could surpass England in her Satanic Majesty? No-body could devise more clever and systematic economic robbery and drainage and ruthless persecutions of the Nationalists.

And India could not be worse off under any other administration. Of course, India wants to be free from any foreign control, and she needs only a breathing space of time to recuperate her energy and the secret strength that will be necessary to drive out the English, would be sufficient to maintain the internal peace and defend the country against any foreign aggression. That will open equally all the markets of the Orient, thereby benefitting all the nations. And farsighted Germany would be shortsighted to imitate the English, while she would enjoy better economic results through her more efficient commercial organizations.

Of course India would fight against any interference with her sovereignty, as against the English, if not more valiantly, with stronger determination and better effectiveness, with the growing consciousness of her nationality.

England has been telling India that if German militarism is not crushed, Germans would never rest content unless they take India.

No wonder the English are regarded as the white devils all over Asia, and have raised prejudice against all Europeans. Even the missionaries are suspected. Divide and rule is her nefarious policy. Intrigue and treachery are her formidable weapons.

No—India does not tremble at the imaginary fear of German invasion. That is not our immediate concern, but only a meta-physical problem. What we are suffering from is British oppression and we need to get ride of it. Whoever hurts England and weakens her, adds to our strength and is our friend. So India rejoices at Germany's success and every shot of her victorious guns sends a joyous thrill all over Asia. They sympathize with France—France of social revolution and of a thousand intimate memories of human progress; they feel for Belgium, and industrious and thrifty democracy. But they are in the wrong camp and they must pay the price for the wicked company they keep. And who can say it is not the retribution of their *Karma*—the wrongs of France in Cambodia and Algeria and her unholy alliance with Russia and England, and surrendering even her political principles for the memory of which she is loved everywhere, even going so far as to refuse the political asylum to our patriot martyr, Savarkar, at the request of England—and Belgium of Kongo fame.

And as to England, not only in a revengeful spirit, but as a policy of self-interest, all the Asiatic Nationalities are convinced that defeat of England and victory of Germany would not only check England's further aggressions in the East but help in reasserting their independence and sovereign dignity; and the disintegration of the vampire British Empire would liberate humanity from the iron shackles of her navalism and the consequent economic slavery with which she is grinding them.

As to England's assertion that if Germany comes out victorious with such a prestige and military record, no nation would be safe and immune against her aggression, as who afterwards would dare to challenge her. No one nation should be left too powerful in international politics, and without taking into consideration the merits and the demerits of the war; it is in the best interests of humanity that German militarism is crushed once for all; and if not, at least the European war is brought to a draw, so that the balance of power is preserved. England by this betrays and forgets her own history. What of her boasted empire, in which the sun never sets? When has England been so saintly and pious? Has she acquired her empire and is it being retained as

a trust by the grace of God for the good of the people and with their consent? If German militarism is not safe for the world, how could the British navalism be? And is it not a greater menace to humanity and has it not proved so? Military force by the very nature of its constitution and circumstances is limited in its operation and movement, while the mistress of the sea should be allowed by the grace of God to roam everywhere and practise its time-honored piracy, sanctified by the name of imperialism.

What hypocrisy! England should be the only one to enjoy unmolested the spoils of her robbery, and any rival must be blackmailed. The veil is too thin even for the unsophisticated, and whom does England expect to fool except those who are in the same boat with her?

Germany does not need our defence. Her arms, success and her accomplishment in every branch of human activity are silently, but more eloquently, answering for themselves. The world is filled with admiration at her marvelous success. Soon the lies will be forgotten and her civil and municipal administration will be regarded as the model for the whole world to imitate.

And if the English are so desirous of serving humanity they should be the last to condemn the school of Bernhardi. Bernhardi after all has followed the footsteps of Darwin and Spencer as honest man, to its logical conclusion. The survival of the fittest is the English philosophy. It is the only argument with which they have been imposing in India, China, Egypt and everywhere. It has been their cardinal political axiom that expansion is a biotic law of growth. It is the only philosophy they have known, preached and practised. Bernhardi, therefore, should be their new prophet of Efficiency and Superman.

Why then condemn? Modern fighting is no longer brute force. It is the coordination of scientific knowledge, technical efficiency and organized national cooperation and sympathy. The fate of nations is decided today in the seclusion of their chemical laboratories and work-shops rather than on the battle-fields. And Germany has contributed more to human knowledge than any other nation, and it will be no exaggeration to say that if all the written records of past achievements

are simultaneously obliterated all over the world as if by a catastrophe and the human race has to begin new its intellectual life, there would be left more accumulated knowledge in living memories in Germany than in the rest of the world combined. Why should not such a nation have a freer hand than England? Why are all obstacles put in her path of progress and expansion? It is because it threatens the British interest?

We do not agree with this school of imperialism. We believe Germany has a better destiny. She can gain much more by being the accepted leader of world's progress, in science, art and industry. Even in material wealth she can get much more by winning the good will and esteem of nations, liberating humanity from the British navalism and tyranny than by political sovereignty over alien peoples, which inevitably lead to grave dangers and complications. The gate of the Oriental trade would be widely flung to her. More than half of humanity would acclaim her as their liberator—the people of India, China, Egypt, Persia and Turkey would gratefully acknowledge her leadership.

What better destiny could await a nation? The world is still in the crucible of strong nationalism. Humanity as a concrete unit is yet in its embryonic process of development. Internationalism, anything but a gigantic monied trust, is a thin, shadowy film. The present war has attested enough to its constitutional vitality. Every nation, how small, insignificant and undeveloped, has some function to serve in the human economy. It cannot be violently shaken by the rude process of war. Paradoxical, though it might appear, history gives ample evidence that this rejuvenates it. If it is unadaptive, time and nature would slowly eliminate it painlessly. War or political subjugation could hardly accomplish this object. In the conflict of ideals, the clash of arms and in the rivalry of nation's economic and industrial expansion, step by step, humanity would be lifting to a higher standard and ideal. When thus the world is federated into free states and each individual and social corporated body could do what ever it desired, in harmony with the ideal and without interfering with the same liberty of others, then not only the earth would be a happier abode to live in than the imaginary heaven of the prophets, the progress would not only be quicker by better exchange

of thoughts and commodities, but a highly organized State like Germany with systematized industrial efficiency would be the greatest beneficiary. The earth is big enough, vast enough to feed and maintain all the growing human population for at least the next thousand years, and in the meantime the unfit would die out by process of natural selection. And Nature's cure, though slow, is the surest cure.

So German victory stands for world-progress and a new epoch of world civilization. England is the worst violator and culprit of the rights of men. Her records are the blackest and cruelest; moreover, she has not the saving virtue of honesty. She is the most shameless hypocrite history has ever recorded.

No wonder India is a state of Guerilla warfare and the whole Peninsula, from the Himalayas to Cape Comoron, is in seething discontent, and any moment the British power may be shattered into pieces and India be lost, as Lord Curzon, one of their craftiest viceroys, predicted. "The loss of India would be setting sun of the British glory."

Yet how England has treated India, and not only that has, mis-represented her to the whole world! She has ruined the arts and industries of India by prohibitive taxation, legislation and many other unwritten discrimination by her inspired magistrates, and then she tells the world that the Indians are impractical and mystic. Instead of protecting the infantile industries as all nations do, she taxes the home industries exorbitantly, so that Manchester traders can easily beat down the prices and ruin the industries of India. She does not spend even a penny per head of the population for the education of India, and there is not more than a primary school in eighteen villages and she tells the world that the Indians do not care for education and are half-civilized and need the British guidance for their own good, while the private schools are not allowed without Governmental permission and inspection, and many schools are closed and suppressed on political suspicion, and its teachers and organizers are persecuted and jailed on any pretext. There is hardly any technical school in India, and no student is allowed to leave without the permission of the authorities and the authorities do not like the students to go anywhere else for education except to England.

England is telling the world that India has been losing her habit of temperance, while she has been exerting her governmental influences to introduce opium and alcohol for the sake of revenue. This is what the American Cyclopedia on Temperance says:—

Previously to the era of British dominion, the inhabitants of India were among the most abstemious of peoples... The British government in India inaugurated its Excise policy in 1790, but for thirty or forty years comparatively little liquor was sold. Until 1878 all the distilleries were owned and operated by the Government, under what was known as the Sudder (or District) system. The sole object was to produce revenues, and it was thought the distilling business would be most profitable if operated by Government itself. Under this system the revenue finally reached considerable proportions in excess of 10,000,000 annually; but the authorities were not satisfied, and a new scheme was devised. In 1878 the new measure or *Abkari* act, was published by the government of Bombay... It is now in force all over India excepting a few small districts under native rule... The right to operate distilleries in competition with the Government is sold at public auctions to the highest bidders. The successful bidder in each locality may distil as much liquor as he chooses, and of any kind, free from government supervision. But the revenue from private distillers is only one element. All the sapbearing palm-trees, yielding juice from which fermented liquor is made, are taxed by the government; the right to sap is farmed out to the highest bidder, and nobody, not even the owner of the trees—can extract sap without government license. Thus the excise policy of India is based on the High License principle exclusively... and it is an active success as a revenue measure.

Statistics given by W.S. Caine in the "House of Commons" (1888) show that in eight years (after the *Abkari* Act) the increase was 135 percent in Bengal; in the Central Province it was 100 per cent in ten years etc. In Ceylon the revenue from drink is almost 14 percent of the total revenue.

"The Government is driving this liquor trade as hard as it can," said Mr. Caine. "Collectors find it the easiest way to

increase their consumption of liquor to the utmost. If the Government continues its present policy of doubling its revenue every ten years, in thirty years India will be one of the most drunken and degraded countries on the face of the earth.

“The Government of India merits commendation for none of the virtuous pretensions...The officials frankly declare that they are interested in the revenue only solely, and not in the promotion of temperance.

In 1888 the Finance Minister for India used the following language in the legislative Council: ‘I look hopefully to a considerable increase in the excise revenues, and believe that a great deal might be done in Northern India by the introduction of the methods which in Bombay and Madras have so powerfully contributed to the increase of revenue under this head.’”

“In the vicinity of Bombay, a movement was started among the country people against the use and sale of liquor, whercup the magistrate had eight of the leaders imprisoned. In reporting this tyrannical act of the Secretary of State in London the government of Bombay said:—

“THE QUESTION FOR DICISION IS, SHALL WE SIT QUIET AND ALLOW THE TEMPERANCE MOVEMENT IN THE COLABA DISTRICT TO CONTINUE AND TO SPREAD, AND THEREBY FORFEIT A LARGE AMOUNT OF REVENUE, OR ARE MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED WHICH WILL BRING THE PEOPLE TO THEIR SENSES?”

It seems the English House of Commons has its reasons of repentance, for it framed, after much opposition, the following resolution (1889)—

“That in the opinion of this House, the fiscal system of the Government of India leads to the establishment of spirit distilleries, liquor and opium shops in large numbers of places, where, till recently, they never existed, in defiance of native opinion and the protests of the inhabitants, and that such increased facilities for drinking produce steadily increasing consumption, and spread misery and ruin among the industrial classes of India”.

The missionaries freely make such statements as the following:—

Archbishop Jeffries (31 years in India): "For one converted christian, as the proof of missionary-labour, the drinking practices of England have made a thousand drunkards."

The methods now undertaken to increase the Opium trade in India are most atrocious. The government controls the crop. The opium is sent from government factories to "Collectors" of the various districts who are also magistrates. These Collectors are the wholesale dealers of the drug, and they sell to contractors, who are forced under heavy fine to sell a certain quantity in their district. If they can not sell as much as they promised they pay a forfeit and the contract is given to others.

"Thus the trade is pushed by the government", says a writer in the *Banner of Asia* (September, 1889), "and the damnation of the people speeds apace."

In licensing ganja, bhang, charas, and majum, the four noxious preparations of Indian hemp, the Christian government of India places itself on a much lower moral plane than the Mohammedan, Turkish and Egyptian governments, which most stringently prohibit them.

"The whole atmosphere of India", said the Hindoo reformer, Keshab Chandra Sen (1870) in a speech at St. James Hall, "seems to abound with cries of thousands of poor helpless widows, who curse the British government for having introduced that thing."

Another accusation—though it does not befit the English people to make it—is that India does not give her women freedom. Why, in ancient times, Indian women used to enjoy more freedom than the modern feminists would desire. But she was compelled to restrict it to guard the social integration and race purity against the Mohammedan licentiousness during the Moghul rule, and strange though it may sound, the truth which is often more startling than fiction is that under British rule the policy of restraint has been found desirable, even by those who believe in the entire freedom of women, on account of Tommy Atkins. In railroad carriages and near the cantonment stations, the outrages are so common that decent

women often do not like to travel alone, in fear of molestation even from the railroad guards of the anglical puritan decent, and many will rather kill themselves than bring shame upon their families by the publicity of a law suit. Yet when suit is brought not unfrequently the offender goes unpunished or is so slightly punished that it is no deterrent to the committal of the crime.

The following cases may be cited: On December 7th, the assistant station master of Rawalpindi outraged the modesty of a girl in the waiting room and thereupon the wronged woman named Viranwate committed suicide. Mr. Moore was simple dismissed from the service. On February 17th, at Barrackpur Cantonment Station a girl of 18, named Kamala was waylaid by William James Walker of the Reliance Jute Mill and assaulted. He was fined 200 rupees. On March 28th, a girl of 20 named Giribala, was outraged by six soldiers at Jhalkati and all of them went scot free with loss of rank only.

This is the justice the English boast of and frequently excuse it by the plea that prestige must be upheld or that the climate is responsible. Not only this, the British regiments where-ever they are stationed, exact from the local magistrate a number of women victims—thus spreading the Englishman's civilization in the shape of alcohol and syphilis wherever they go.

Another pet argument in favour of British rule is that the Hindus and Mohammedans hate each other, and if the British power is withdrawn, they will cut each other's throats, and it is therefore, for their own good that England sends so many of her best youths to suffer the dis-comforts of a tropical climate. How unselfish! What a martyrdom for humanity! The whole truth is that it is one of their favourite policies to incite the one against the other. They even use the worst class of criminals for their purposes, and in the Jamalpur case these were engaged by the Government to attack Hindu women, to show how helpless they were without British help. Of course, the whole country is dis-armed and as not even a heavy stick is permitted, how can they defend themselves against the ruffians, inspired by the Government officials. They can not even help themselves against the wild animals, and the annual loss of property for

their revages is quite formidable. Moreover, when they defend their homes and the family honor, the Government easily picks out the leaders, and under the pretense of a riot puts them into prison, and in this way can also easily take hold of the more spirited members of a community and select them for further persecutions. Commenting on this policy, of the Government, the conservative paper *The Tribune*, of Lahore, said on May 3d:

“The situation in East Bengal is alarming in all conscience. The benefit policy of Divide at imera, of which the ex-Lieutenant Governor Sir Bamfylde Fuller was in the high priest, which still rules the mind of many officials—there is now seen its bitter fruit, and for once it seems as if the reign of order and law is just at an end, at least at Jamalpur.”

In one case, in March 1907, when the people defended the homes and honor of their women, the government, instead of punishing the rowdies, arrested the leaders; Nibaran Chandra Roy, Inspector, sentenced to death; Mongal Singh, Constable, transportation for life; Dwaraka Nath Dey, Lawyer, Transportation for life; Upendra Chandra Chakrabarty, Landholder; Surendra Guha, Shatish Choudhary, Bejoy Gupta, Basanta Sen, Upendra Dey, Basanta Choudhery, students; Paresh Sen, Satish Bannerjee, Superintendent of States; Biseswar Roy, Mahin Ghose, Dwarka Sen, Mohin Dey, Jogesh Dutt, Nishi Mukherjee, Lawyers; Dr. Prakash Dutt, Nogendra Dey, Sishir Ghose, Indra Nandi, Bipin Ganguli, Narendra Bose. Prakash Dutta and Girindra sen.

Thus it is evident that the Government incites one religion against the other whenever it serves its political purposes and even tries to divide the country by creating an artificial barrier by introducing provincial dialects in the schools, thus bestowing favour upon one to the disadvantage of the other. Even the *Englishman* protests against such a policy, and in its issue of July 14, 1906, says:—

“Loyalty, patriotism, race feeling and kindred qualities may be philosophically described as aspects of sentiment, but even the most practical people hesitate before they trample all sentiments underfoot. Probably there is no national, the

characteristics of which have excited so much division of opinion, as the Bengal. Friends and foes, however, are inclined to credit them with possessing a great deal of sentiment. When, therefore, a proposal is made which would amongst any races excite sentimental opposition, why should the government go out of its way to assert that the Bengali opposition must be artificial? Lord Curzon and the Secretary of State may have found, however, a number of grave reasons why Eastern Bengal should be cut off from the rest of the province and added into Assam."

In every progressive movement in any country it is a few strong thinking individuals who blaze out the trail—paving the path with their blood and ideals—while the majority remains sympathetic but passive, and a few betray the cause and the country for money or lust of power. The British authorities always appeal to that class of people, and in order to make their utterances serve the object, give them titles and make them self-styled leaders and circulated their stories of treachery as proofs of India's loyalty. What an audacity on the part of the British to expect India to be loyal to her—and what for? For ruining the country in every way? It is the boast of Britain that England has brought peace to India. Yes, if it be peace, it is the peace of the grave, where millions of souls are crying out for revenge. If they had the choice, they would rather prefer the living unrest on the earth than the peace in the tomb of eternity. Of course, if it is due to famine, what can England do? The only thing she can do is to pack herself out of the country if she believes in humanity, as she pretends, and India would be one of the richest countries in a few years. Famine and pestilence are due to her wicked administration. India exports even in her worst years more grain than Canada and Argentine produce from their virgin soil in their fat years. And the productivity can be raised ten-fold by a better system of irrigation and drainage. Every year in the rainy season—there are floods filling the soil with silt and the land with malaria, while in the summer millions go thirsty for want of a drop of water. Yet millions are spent every year for military expenses, and more millions to feed the easy-chair politicians at home and the cupidity of their wire-pullers—Beer Barons and Merchant-

Pirates—and there is hardly anything left for the improvement and sanitation of the country. England wants all the money she can get: and what does she care what happens to India as long as it fills her pocket? Rather she prefers that India should be in an acute state of malnutrition, so that she does not have vitality enough to revolt and as for education she has had already enough for administration. It may be said that it is not the fault of England, but rather of India herself, who is so weak as to tolerate her and that weakness is a crime in modern age. Why do 315 millions of people allow a couple of hundred thousand soldiers to rule them? Humanity is guided by self interest and not by idealistic phraseology. It is the diplomatic wisdom of England to say to the world that she is in India for the sake of good administration, but is there any thinking being who does not understand that India is her milk-cow and which she will keep as long as she can? This is a political and economic truism. India knows it and understands it. And she hates the British hypocrisy and mean mis-representations more than her tyrannical abuse of power. If she had an honest enemy, it might save much of the bloodshed. India knows she has to gather strength secretly before she can strike the blow. It is known that failure on either side would not be tempered with toleration and sympathetic justice and no quarter would be either asked by nor given to the vanquished.

England often makes the assertion that India's population has been increasing at such an enormous rate, under the peace and protection of the British rule, that famine is the consequence and nature's only check, while the truth is quite different. Almost all nations have doubled their population during the last 30 years, while in India, to quote *Patrika* of December 24, 1906:—

“There are leaders who think that we are rather impatient, that we must wait for a reasonable time to secure substantial self-government from the rulers. The mischief, however, is that the nation can not even wait ten years. They would have gladly waited fifty years more but where would the higher classes be by that time? During the last fifty years, more than half of our big and respectable families have gone. With the next few decades the remaining half will vanish.”

And this is no exaggeration or fancy. Statistic are more convincing:—

		<i>Average increase of population per year, per million.</i>
Germany, 1837	Germany, 1911	
31,589,547	64,925,993	14,528
Belgium, 1866	Belgium, 1912	
4,827,833	7,571,387	11,919
England, 1871	England, 1911	
21,495,131	31,045,270	11,726
Japan, 1908	Japan, 1914	
49,588,804	53,696,888	10,270
Hungary, 1880	Hungary 1910	
15,737,259	20,886,487	11,443
India, 1861	India, 1911	
215,798,302	302,494,794	8,636
British India, 1901	British India, 1911	
231,61 Mlns.	244.27 Millions	5,623
Native States, 1901	Native States, 1911	
62,755,116	70,888,854	13,085

The conclusion is too obvious that under British rule the average increase of the population (British India is the smallest of any country), while in native States it is only second to Germany.

It is the boast of England that her courts are just and impartial. It must be admitted that they are often very fair, when both parties are from among the people themselves, although there is a great deal of police corruption. But when the case lies between the Englishman and an Indian, there is only a mockery of justice, and as for political cases one recent example may be cited as a good criterion of the British sense of justice.

Lahore sedition case: 102 arrests, 6 sentenced to death, 45 transportation for life, 8 four years rigorous imprisonment each, 12 rigorous imprisonment from 3 to 10 years each, 9 escaped.

Justice is often so revengefully administered that even

tender boys are whipped into unconsciousness. Even the *Morning Leader* protests against such brutality and in its issue of December 12, 1907, London it says:—

“Many who are by no means enthusiastic opponents of corporal punishment, would be startled at the latest example of judicial flogging in Bengal. The case is reported in length in India. A boy of 7 was accused by a constable of hitting him with a stone, while he was on Latral duty at Mymensingh. There is grave doubt about the truth of the charge in the first place. The constable said he saw the lad throwing the stone at him. Yet one of the witnesses of the prosecution deposed that he himself had been first seized by the constable and charged with throwing it. In spite of this, the Magistrate Mr. Garlick, refused to grant the defence an adjournment for the purpose of summoning absent witnesses and passed sentence of 30 stripes on the boy prisoner. Perhaps the best commentary on this outrageous judgement is that the civil surgeon declared that the child could not stand it, and so the number was reduced to 6. We can only hope that Mr. Morley will lose no time in peremptorily putting down a system under which ignorance and brutality can thus degarde the administration of law and our national reputation.”

But the English sence of justice can be still more clearly comprehended by reading the following item of news which appeared in the *Englishman* of May 17, 1906:

“The district magistrate of Mymensingh wrote to the Sub-divisional officer or Tangail the following letter: In the case under Section 147 of the penal code against Rajendra Saha and Purna Saha, please take care that the case is disposed of promptly and the prosecution witnesses are not unnecessarily troubled. Let me have a copy of the orders you pass on the order-sheet each day the cases come up for trial.”

Any comment on this is superfluous; yet the English are not ashamed to accuse the Germans of cruelty or injustice.

As for the freedom of the press and the loyalty of the country, in the first ten months of the war more than 200 newspapers have been suppressed and the money deposits of 625 and 378 printing houses have been confiscated. Lala Lajpat Rai, a social reformer and leader of the Arya-Samaj, and a victim of the British persecution—now an exile in U.S.A. calculates through meager press reports that all the lowest estimate there have been more than 3,000 arrests since the beginning of the war. That is the loyalty of which England was boasting all over the world. Of course the British Tyranny is not a new thing. It is not all due to the excitement and nervousness of the war. It is concomitant with the British administration. Take for an example a quiet year, 1907-1908, and it will be evident that hands of British are never free from blood and tyranny.

July 5—Bhupendra Nath Dutta, Editor, *Jugantar*, Calcutta, sentenced by Kinsford to one Year's rigorous imprisonment, under Section 124A.

April 17—Chagna Lal Lal Bhai Thanawala, editor, *Hind Swaraj*, 2 years on 124 A by Aston.

April 11—Shatish Chandra Mukerjee, of *Anushilan* Calcutta, 18 months and 500 Rs., by Kinsford.

June 3—Shivaram Mahadev Paranjape, editor, *Kalpoona*, 9 months on 124 A. Shattni Narain, editor, *Swaraj*, 3 years and Rs. 1000. Pandit Panchanana Tarkaratna, Dr. Braja Roy Ghose, Ram Gopal Bhattacharjee, Kali Dass Bhattacharjee, Ram Ranjan Bhattacharjee and Hari Dass Bhattacharjee of Bhatpara, arrested on bomb charge of Kakinara.

July 10—Hati Lal Varma, 7 years transportation; Ram Sarup, Superintendent, Vedic Ashrama, 3 years by F.G. Terry, Aligarh; Etraj Surendra Nath Iyer, Lecturer, Madras, 5 years transportation.

August 19, Narayanganj, Trailokya Nath Chakrabarty, Jadu Nath Dass and Benode Behari Chakrabarty arrested.

August 20—Poona, Kelkar, editor, *Marathi* 14 days and Rs. 1,000.

July 20—Bombay, Dhondu Kashi Nath Phadke, editor *Arunodaya*, 14 months.

June 25—Poona, Bal Gangadhar Tilak 6 years.

June 27—Monoranjan Guha, editor, *Nabasakti* and Raja

Rai CharanDhobal, arrested at Giridi, and sentenced 6 months and Rs. 1,000.

July 12—Basudeb Bhattacharyya, editor, *Sonar Bangla* Calcutta, arrested.

July 13—Lahore, Ram Singh, Upadehak Ghasit Ram, Sowaran Singh, Gobordhan Dass, Kabar Singh of Bharat Mata, arrested. Lala Jaswant Rai proprietor, *Punjabee*, Lahore 2 years and Rs. 1,000. Athavale, Editor, the *Punjabee*, 6 months and Rs. 200.

September 11—Bhrama Bhandab Upadhya, editor, *Sandhya* (died in the confinement); Sarada Charan Sen, Manager; Hari Charan Sen, Printer.

September 13—Dacca, Promatha and Khagendra, arrested in Janmastami riot; Mahendra Nath Chatterjee, publisher of *Sandhya*; Baikunta Chandra Acharyya, publisher of *Jugantar*, 2 years and Rs. 1,000; Muzzaferpur, Jugal Kishore Singh 6 to 9 months and Rs. 200 each; Isher Dass, Amba Prased.

July 10—Aligarh, Fuzulhasain, editor, *Urdu Imananila*, arrested.

July 16, Dacca, Makhan Lal Sen, head master, Sonarangh National School.

July 20—Ghoramara Pandit Givinda; Poona, P.M. Bapat, 7 years and Rs. 1000; Kolahpur, Gokhale 2 years; Dhandu Kashi Nath Phadke, editor Arunodaya, 14 months.

April 6—Tinnevelly Locknath Iyer, teacher Hindu College, suspended; Vithal Rao, of Medical service suspended; Bal-krishna Narain Patak, editor, Behari, Bombay, 6 months.

November 11—Manickganj, Jnan Sankar Roy, Nibaran Chandra Dass, Ramesh Chandra Sarkar, Prem Nath Gope and Prabhat Shankar Roy, 6 months each.

August 26—Cocanda, Narsing Rao 2 years and seven others 10 months each.

June 20—The printing materials of *Jugantar*, *Sonar Bangla*, *Sandhya* and *Bande Mataram*, seized and confiscated; commilla, Satish Chandra Roy arrested.

August 7—Basanta Kumar Bhattachayya, printer, 20 years; Abinash Bhattacharyya, Manager; Sailendra Nath Bose, Assistant Manager and Jotish Chandra Roy arrested.

October 24—Sarada Charan Sen, Manager and Hari Charan Das, printer of *Sandhya* arrested.

October 12—Bhaskar Bisnu Phadke, editor of *Behari*, Bombay, 2 years, and Rs. 200.

October 24—Basanta Kumar Majumadar, Rangpur.

October 8—The editor of *Bharata Bhaha* and eight others.

September 24—A.C. Bannerjee, Bar-at-Law

September 18—Barrisal, Durga Mohon Sen, editor of *Barisal Hitaishi*, Shandpur Surendra Nath Dinajpur.

September 24—Durga Chandra Sanyal, Lawyer, transportation for life.

December 22—Nagpur, Hari Kishore, Lecturer.

December 23—Bombay, Bhaskar Balwant Bhapatkar, Editor of *Bhala*.

March 2—Tuticorin Chidamberam Pillai, Director Swadeshi Steam Navigation Co., Transportation for life; Subramanya Siva, 10 years; Shola, Poona Limaje. Editor, *Hind Swaraj*, 3 years; Birendra Nath Bannerjee of *Jugantar*, 3 years; Phanindra Nath Mitra of *Jugantar*, arrested.

April 27—Tinnevelly Gurunath Iyer, Station Officer, 7 years transportation; Lokhnath Iyer, teacher, 5 years and Rs. 2000; Shanker Narain Pillai, merchant 5 years and Rs. 500; Ram Langan Pillai, 5 years and Rs. 500; Shanker Narain Iyer 5 years; Kangatha Nath Pillai 5 years and 61 others accused and the punishment varying from 6 months to 3 years; Tuticorin, Padmanava Iyenger, Siva Gurunath Pillay, Niberan Chandra Pal, editor, *Matri Puja*, Rs. 200, Kolatkar, editor, *Desha Shevak* Nagpur.

March 24—Delhi, Syed Haider Reja, editor.

March 25—Aftab, Ganesh Chandra Das.

April 11—Girindra Nath Sen, one month; Shonar Bangla, Keshav Printing Works seized.

April 24—Barrisal, Dr. Abdul Gaffoor, 18 months; Moulavi Liyakat Hossain, 2 years and 6 months; Muzzafarpur, Profulla Chandra Chaki, shot; Khudiram Bose, sentenced to death. Alipur, Calcutta, Barinder Kumar Ghose; and Ullaskar Dutta, first sentenced to death latter transportation for life; Upendra Nath Bannerjee, Bibhuti Bhusan Sarkar Roy, Birendra Chandra Sen, Sudhir Kumar Sarkar, Indra Nath Nandi, Abinash Chandra Bhattacharyya, Sailendra Nath Bose, Hem Chandra Das, Rishi Kesh Kanjilal and Indu Bhusan Roy, all sentenced to transportation for life; Paresh Chandra Mullick, Sisir Kumar

Ghose, Nirapada Roy, 10 years each, Ashok Chandra Nandi, Balkrishan Harikane and Sisir Kumar Sen, 7 years each, Krishna Jiban Sanyal 1 year. After one year's confinement the following were acquitted: Arabindra Ghose, Nalini Kanta Sarkar, Kanji Lal Saha. Bejoy Kumar Nag, Narendra Nath Bagchi, Purna Chandra Sen, Hemendra Nath Ghose, Din Dayal Bose, Birendra Nath Ghose, Dharani Nath Sen Gupta, Nagendra Nath Sen Gupta, Hem Chandra Sen, Birendra Kumar Sen, Nikhileswar Roy Mullick, Bejoy Chandra Bhattacharyya and Prakash Chander Dey. Narendra Nath paid the penalty of a traitor. Satyendra Nath Bose and Kanai Lal Dutta were hanged. Charu Chandra Roy and Debi Brata Bose released.

May 10—Lala Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh deported.

May 18—Bombay, Chagan Lal Lalu Bhai Thanawala, editor of *Hind Swaraj*; 4 years: Allahabad, Ram Hari, editor of *Swaraj* 7 years.

May 1—Rawalpindi, Gopichand, 7 years and Rs. 200; Kishan Singh and Mongul Singh, 7 years each; Gashi Ram 3 years, Nanda Lal 6 months and Rs. 200. And there were varying punishment for the rest of 87 accused, and among whom the following were important members: Munsa Ram, Moti Ram, Amrita Ram, Sira Nanda, Amir Chand, Daulat Ram; Shanker Das, Dina Nath, Ghulam Mohamed, Thakur Das, Moti Lal, Chet Ram, Sunder Singh, Bhagat Latka Singh, Lala Hans Raj, Lala Amlokram, Lala Gurudas Ram, Roy Maya Das, Sardar Khazan Singh, Janki Nath Kaul, M. Mausram, Mangal Singh, Gopi Chand, Kishan Singh, Nanda Ram, Jagat Singh, Uttam Chand Abnot, Bod Raj, Danlar Ram, Premsha, Hirananda, Haram Singh, Amir Chand, Fakir Singh, Hukam Chand, Gopal Dass, Ammal Ram, Mathur Das Dharan, Nanak Singh, Kirpa Ram, Khazon Singh, Narsing Das, Fakira Singh, Lala Gobind Ram.

July 20—Poona, Abba Saheb Ram Chandra, Director Industrial School of Art.

July 30—Lahore, Lal Chand, 9 months, Sivan Singh, Kartar Singh, Bhalia Ram, Rusingh, Ghasit Ram and Ghoberdas, 18 months each; Gandersein, 15 months each; Gandersein, 15 months and 3 stripes; Ram Chand and Nanda Singh. Ashwani Kumar Dutta, Satish Chandra Chatterjee, Manrajan Guha, Pulin Behari Das, Bhupesh Chandra Nag, Subodh Chandra Mallick, Sachindra

Prasad Bose, Krishan Kumar Mitra and Syan Sunder Chakraborty, deported.

March 17—Chandpur, Barada Kanta Roy, Umesh Chandra Sarkar and Shashi Choudhery.

June 30—Agra, Pandit Bhoja Dutta, Editor *Mussafir*, 1 month.

July 1—Beni Bhusan Roy, Lecturer of Khulna.

July 1—Commilla, Keshav Chandra Bannerjee and Shashi Bhattacharjee, inspectors, suspended from the service for not giving evidence as desired by the officiating magistrate.

May 12—Chandpur, Nibaran Chandra Bagchi, *Swaraj* Mayvaram Mathura Das, Lecturer, Bombay, Bashkar Balwant Bhopatkar, editor of *Bhala*, Midnapur, Dev Das Karan, Ganendra Nath Bose, Rash Behari Bose, Upendra Nath Maiti, Abinash Ch. Mittra, Khagendra Nath Bannerjee, Jamini Nath Mallick, Gopal Chandra Bannerjee, Manmatha Nath Kar, Chandra Bose, Raja Narendra Lal Khan Bahadur, Jag Jivan Bose, Santosh Das, 17 years transportation; Surendra Mukerjee, 7 years; Jag Jivan Ghose 10 years; Prof. Bijapurkar and Joshi, editor *Vishavarta*, 2 years, Dina Nath, editor, *Hindustan* 5 years, Pindi Das, editor, *India*, 5 years *Hindustan* Press confiscated.

May 23—Bombay, Ram Chandra, Narain Mandake, editor, *Vihari*; Tara Nath Choudhery, Guna Nath Sarkar, Kartic Chandra Dutta, 6 years; Satish Chandra Bagchi, Mukhada Charan Samadhya Panna Lal Chakraverty, 3 years and 6 months; Suresh Chandra Mitra, 5 years; Birendra Kumar Mullick, Dhirender Nath Ghose; Monmath Nath Roy, Suresh Chandra Mazumdar, 5 years; Khulna, Hira Lal Sen Gupta, 15 months.

June 19—Combatore, Krishna Swami Sharma, transportation for 5 years.

This is England's record of good administration for twelve months, and it should have made any nation blush to accuse others of tyranny. Yet England accuses German Administration in Belgium. As one of her greatest poets has said: Shame is ashamed to sit on her brow.

Thus England stands not only everywhere in the way of India's progress, even in the direction of social reforms, but she is the greatest reactionary force in the East today. She seeks to

ally herself with the superstition and religious prejudices of the Orient. Those who are for social progress and for educational advance are often persecuted on trumped up sedition charges. Arya Samaj, a great social reform movement in India, is under the ban of the British Government. Physical Culture Societies like Annushilan, Mutual Help Societies like Brati, Shadhana and Abhinab Vharata have been suppressed by relentless persecution. Even those who favour the industrial development of the country incur the displeasure of the authorities. The moneyed and rich classes are warned not to associate with such movements, and active workers are sent to prison on the slightest pretext. The officials of the districts use their influence and authority to push the British goods in the market. Spies infest every place. Even the seclusion of the home, private correspondence and the sanctity of the temples are not respected.

Balgangadhar spoke the truth when he said: "England's policy was to ruin our trade and—war disguised as commerce came. The Government was always mixing politics with commerce."

The *Bengalee* in its issue of June 27, 1905, says: "Mr. Lyal, the District Magistrate of Bhagalpur, sent for Sir Mohan Thakur and severely took him to task for accepting the chairmanship of a *Swadeshi* industrial development of the country) meeting. Babu Surja Prasad, who had accepted the honorary secretaryship was similarly subpoenaed and warned not to join the *Swadeshi* movement under any circumstances. Babu Giridhari Sahai, a honorary magistrate and merchant, was not only rebuked and warned against the consequences, but the despotic magistrate would not let him off until he had extracted from Babu Giridhari a sort of pledge not to allow his son Basant Lal to have anything with the *Swadeshi*. Mr. Lyal, not content with intimidating the leading Beharis with this or that or other thing, has actually gone to the length of preaching against *swadeshi* in the course of his official tour."

If this were all we would not have much reason to complain. But this is the least part of what the British authorities are doing. They often make false charges against those who will not handle British goods or try to foster the industry of the country, and harrass them in every possible way. What

the high governmental officials do not like to do themselves, for fear of publicity, their police agents accomplish to their masters' entire satisfaction. And nowhere else is the police system so corrupt as in India. It is the very backbone of a bureaucracy. The British people who profess to be free traders at home stop at nothing to secure preference for their merchandise in India. On China they made war to thrust opium upon an unwilling people—in India they carry on a constant commercial war for the purpose of forcing the sale of their goods, almost at the point of the bayonet. What England lacks in modern methods of efficient management, cheap production and good salesmanship, she wants to make up with the help of tyranny and monopoly. Let us take the year 1906-07, far removed from the turmoil of political agitation, an uneventful year from the administration's point of view, and see how England helps India in her industrial growth.

But though India is poverty stricken and hard-oppressed, but very few betray the country for the sake of money, though alluring temptations are put before them. Every now and then the government offers big rewards to get the political suspects. Yet they succeed very seldom. Just for an example, on one day alone, March 17, 1916, the following rewards were offered: Rash Behari Bose of Chand Nagar Rs. 7,500; Gurudutta Kumar, Rs. 2000; G.D. Kumar Singh, Rs. 2000; Jeward Singh of Nangal Kelat, Rs. 2000; Joswant Singh of Bulacher Rs. 2000; Ram Chandra of Hoshiarpur, Rs. 2000; Harnam Singh of Kailta, Rs. 2000; Arjun Singh of Rawalpindi Rs. 2000; Dr. Mathura Singh of Chakwan, Rs. 2000; Sardar Singh of Hoshiarpur, Rs. 2000; Sunder Singh of Jhelam, Rs. 2000; Ram Nath of Shava, Rs. 1000; Gurudat Singh of Shivali, Rs. 1000; Daljit Singh of Muktasar, Rs. 500; Akur Singh of Sangur, Rs. 500; Pur Singh of Jullunder Rs. 500; Arjun Singh of Amritsar Rs. 500; Hardet Singh of Dhaewal, Rs. 200; Arjun Singh of Pahat Bari Rs. 200; Sher Singh of Neva State, Rs. 100; Kishen Singh of Shawndal Rs. 100; Kimel Singh of Akhern Rs. 100; Sur Singh of Fategarh of Rs. 100.

And though the political prisoners are counted with the criminal and treated worst, yet the criminal record is the lowest in India.

<i>Country</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Criminals convicted</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
	1911	1911	
Austria	28,324,940	592,192	2.09
Belgium	7,423,784	46,625	.63
England and Wales	36,070,492	570,723	1.58
France	39,601,509	701,744	1.77
Germany	64,925,993 ('10)	546,481 ('10)	.84
Italy	35,238,997 ('13)	556,787 ('13)	1.61
India (British)	244,267,542	391,238	.16

Dadabhai Naorji formerly a member of the British Parliament said in his presidential address of the Indian National Congress, 1906;

If good government could never be a substitute for self-government by the people themselves, how much less was an economically evil government and a constitutionally unconstitutional government a substitute for self-government? Are the descendants of the earliest civilizers to remain in the present time of spreading emancipation—under the barbarous system of despotism—unworthy of British instincts, principles and civilization?"

Yet there are many who excuse the British government on the ground that Britain is bearing the white man's burden in the East. They admit the injustice and inhuman oppression of the British authorities. They are frank enough to acknowledge that on no principle, ethical, political, moral or international the British course of action can be defended or sanctioned. But Britain is the guardian of the East and she should not be too harshly criticised or the power, prestige, influence, and commercial privileges of the white man would disappear like a doom in the Orient. The Occident is overpopulated. Her industries have surplus productions and must have markets. The Orient has teeming millions and vast natural resources undeveloped. She should be held in common as a monopoly for all the white races. Of course England has gone there first and she must have her lion's share and the rest we take as best we can. Thus think many English, Russian, Dutch, French and Americans. How deluded. Gita says: "When a man is near

his destruction, he loses first his right thinking powers." They forget the lessons of history. Greece fell: her civilization was based on slave labour, and she lacked the dignity of manual work. Fell Carthage for her commercial greed. Rome fell, whose proud legions knew no more worlds to conquer—fell when her hour of trial came, as she had no men of her own, but hired mercenary soldiers her battles to fight. The Empire of Napoleon disappeared in a night—as it came in a day, for his vain desire to dominate the whole of Europe, leaving nothing behind but dreamful, vivid and inspiring recollections of history. And the passing of the Anglo-Saxon is being written in the history of today, with blood and iron.

One half of humanity can not remain to be slaves and the rest free. Slavery debases both. The master loses the dignity of work, power of endurance and hardship and an ideal by dint of which he secured his domination. Easy-earned money softens, like a subtle poison, the manly and moral vigor and debauches body and mind in luxury and corruption—in outward cristalized conventionalities and bravadoes. The slave loses a good deal, but not so much. As a means of self-preservation, he learns to lie and to cheat to escape the wrath and tyranny of his master. But the master loses much more by losing the very qualities by which he attained his mastery.

This is the very spectable England is presenting before the world today. She has light-heartedly entered into this world war to capture the German trade. Her great statesman, Lord Curzon, whose only qualification of being great that as Viceroy of India, he ruled the country with blood and sword, assured England that it would be an easy job. Russia and France would fight, and the only thing necessary would be to send a few Gurkhas to dictate peace at Potsdam. Colonel Churchill told them he would dig out the German Navy like rats and, who can say, he may not be dug out himself some day out of a London hole by German officers. Of course, Kitchener would make a springdive. His only qualification of a great soldier is that in cold blood he massacred seventeen thousand Sudanese Dervishes at Ondurman, who in good faith surrendered to him and on his way to Lassa he killed many more innocent and harmless unarmed Lamas, and for which he is known all over Asia as Butcher Kitchener. And this 18

months of war have proved that Britannia is only a giantess with wooden legs. She has not won a single battle either on land or on sea. On land she has been disastrously beaten everywhere, and on sea Britannia no longer rules the waves. Yet though England is passing through her deathpangs of disintegration, her constant appeals for men have been futile and unresponsive. Why should the men go and fight. They have nothing to gain, but everything to lose. Tyrants are tyrants everywhere. They can not change their former mode of habits. Their souls become calous and inconsiderate of other peoples' feelings and comforts. Kitchener who killed in cold-blood Fellaheens of Egypt and Lamas of Tibet, sent his own countrymen in thousands to their inevitable doom without a thought. These men can not rouse national patriotism. Accustomed to enervating luxury of easy earned money, their soul becomes degenerate. Each officer goes to the battle field with two servants and a groom as if to a marriage ceremony. No wonder the British labouring class has not responded to their calls. They have suffered enough from their ruthless hands. British defeat would be their true emancipation. In Imperial Britain they have not an inch of ground to claim as their home and hearth—though millions of acres are preserved as game for the privileged; the land they till belongs to the absent landlords who swell from the sweat on their brow. They have only the empty talks of their easy chair corrupt politicians to feed on, that the Empire belongs to them and they must bear all its burdens and sufferings and enjoy few of its privileges. Such an etherial food is not sufficient to make a man sacrifice his everything for the pleasures, treachery and intrigues of his tyrannical over-lords.

As to the dominance of the Orient by concerted or a single power—it is a vain delusion. It will be much easier to check the tides of the ocean with porous sands. It is impossible and suicidal even to attempt to keep three-quarter of the human race in bondage when they have been once awakened to their consciousness. You can fool some of the people all the time—You can fool all the people part of the time, but you can not fool all the people all the time. The Orient has been awakened from the slumber and lethargy of centuries, and any attempt to enslave her liberated soul

would simply create race-antagonism and hatred and prolong the war—and then it can not be done. The dismemberment of the British Empire means a new epoch of World civilization. Federation of World Republics and Brotherhood of man.

Of course they are blaming Germany for betraying European hegemony and interests. The allied powers feel that Germany has ended their happy dreams and their imperial existence is at stake. There is an old saying that when two thieves quarrel—truth comes out. But in all justice and fairness it must be admitted that Germany owes her first duty to her own interest—not the interest of these international political thieves, cut-throats, and rogues. Self-preservation is the first law of nature. And why should she give precedence to British interests? Is she physically, morally, intellectually inferior to any? Why should she subordinate her own interest to those of others—because it ends their happy schemes and dreams?

Mohammedans are praying, Allah is great; and the Gita says; “when injustice prevails and Earth is oppressed, I come again and again to redeem Humanity.” Let therefore, all lovers of humanity rejoice at British defeat and German victory. Earth has suffered enough from British oppression. What we have cited has been taken from the official records and can be corroborated in any important library. Yet it is but an insignificant part of the whole story of British despotic oppression. Such a government has no right to exist. It is a mockery, even to call it a government. It is simply legalized piracy. Against such an inhuman tyranny Indian Revolutionary Forces have declared war. India knows she has to fight her own battles and make her own destiny. She has to fight against a remorseless, unscrupulous and cruel foe, who keeps no word of honor and for whom no pledge has any sanctified inviolability. Against so mean and treacherous an enemy, hatred has almost become religious passion. Mob-violence can not always be prevented in such a state of affairs, as guerilla warfare is the only thing possible in a disarmed country. Though India abhors bloodshed—it is the only way to her emancipation. However, it is believed the country that in ancient days—in the time of Asoka—established hospitals for animals and today millions would

rather die of starvation than rob living creatures of their lives for their food, would not be blood thirsty, even in retaliation. But as accidents are unavoidable in a war, we advise those who have relatives or friends in India to warn them, not to associate too closely with the English, to avoid being mistaken for them and to put on a small flag or identification badge on their dress as a preventive measure, so that no mistake will be possible. India only hates England and she cherishes no other feeling but friendly respect for other nationalities. Of course it all depends on how England behaves. If she realizes that nothing can now prevent India becoming free, then the world might be spared another prolonged and sanguine war in the East. It might also do good to England to purge her soul of impurities as in a fiery furnace. India is determined to fight as long as her Flag of Independence does not float proudly from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin. As victim of British despotism and economic brigandage, India loses more men every year, in peace time under British rule, than would she lose in a war with England in ten years.

Let therefore, all lovers of humanity rejoice at the defeat of British Arms— and disintegration of the British Empire, based on relentless prosecution and oppression, would liberate the earth of the iron shackles that have bound her for centuries. Let all lovers of Justice, Freedom and Humanity rejoice at the Birth of a New Nation and Free India extends for mutual cooperation her cordial greetings to all.

Index

- Africa, 42, 46, 55
 America, 20, 23, 42, 44, 45, 58, 63-64, 69, 72, 74
 Amir Chand, 21Fn
 Ampthill, Lord, 30
 Arabia, 54
 Arnold, Sir Edwin, 43
 Asia, 42, 43, 44, 46, 54, 55, 56, 57
 Australia, 41, 42, 44, 46, 61
 Austria, 49
 Babbit, 48
 Balmokand, 21, 22, 24
 Balraj, 21, 24
 Basu, Bhupendra Nath, 23, 24, 36, 48, 49, 52
 Behar, 23
 Belgian, 42
 Bengal, 23
 Bhagwan Singh, 72
 Bhawanagree, Sir, M. 51
 Bhiwani, 14
 Bilgrami, Syed Hussain, 28Fn
 Birkenhead, 34
 Bombay, 26
 Bourassa, Henry, 40
 Britain, 40, 41, 46, 49, 55, 56, 65, 73
 British: See under Britain
 California, 41, 44
 Canada, 38, 39, 40, 41, 44, 45, 61
 Canadian Parliament, 40
 Chicago, 69
 China, 39, 41, 55
 Chinese: See under China
 Chisolm, Valentine, 51, 52, 60
 Cole, G.D.H. 48
 Council of India, 30
 Council of India Bill, 25
 Crewc, Lord, 23, 26, 30-31, 35, 51
 Curzon, 28, 30, 33
 Daily Mail, 53
 Daily News, 40
 Delhi, 21-22Fn., 31
 Dube, Bhagwan Din, 51
 Egypt, 49, 54
 England, 20, 23, 26, 29, 30, 34, 35, 48, 49, 55, 56, 59, 60-61, 63, 65-66, 68
 Europe, 55-56, 61
 France, 35, 40, 42, 49, 64
 Gradiner, A.C. 40
 Germany, 42, 49, 54-55, 57, 63-64, 69-70
 Gokhale, G.K., 36
 Government of India, 26, 28-29, 34
 Greece, 54
 Gupta, K.G., 28Fn.
 Gurdit Singh, Baba, 38-39
 Hansraj, Lala, 21, 24
 Hardinge, 21-22, 46
 Hindus, 38, 41, 44-46, 50, 57
 House of Lords, 24-25, 31
 India, 23, 26, 29-31, 33-34, 38, 40, 42, 46, 49, 51-62, 64, 68
 India Office, 24-28, 32, 35, 39
 India Office Bill, 25
 Indian Civil Service, 26

- Indian Legislative Councils, 33
 Indian National Congress, 23, 26, 32, 50, 51, 52, 57, 61
 Ireland, 65
 Irish, 30
 Japan, 41, 43-45, 54-55, 64, 71, 74
 Japan Advertiser, 73
 Japanese: See under Japan
 Jinnah, M.A., 24, 50
 Jullunder, 21
 Karachi, 23
 Kipling, Joseph Rudyard, 39
 Komagata Maru, 38-40-42, 46-47, 57
 Lahore, 21-22, 24
 Lajpat Rai, Lala, on Lahore conspiracy case, 21-23; at the Karachi Congress Session, 23; visit to England, 23-24; on India Council Bill, 24-34; attitude towards Sir William Wedderburn, 35-37; on Komagata Maru affair, 38-47; on the First World War, 49-62; on the Indian student in England, 63-68; visit to America, 69-71; visit to Japan, 72-74
 Laureate, 61
 Law, Andrew Bonard, 52
 Liberal Government, 30, 32
 Liberal Press, 29
 London, 31, 33, 40, 49, 51, 67
 London Nation, 30
 Madras, 20
 Manchester Guardian, 53
 Mehta, Pherozechah, 53
 Meredith, 35-36, 51
 Montagu, Edwin, 25-27, 29
 Montreal, 40
 Morley, 26, 29, 31, 34
 Morning Post, 27
 Mukden, 43
 Municipal Committee, 20
 Musalmans, 50
 Natal, 42, 44, 61
 National Liberal Club, 49, 50-51
 New Leader, 46
 New Statesman, 31, 54, 59, 63
 Okuma, Count, 43
 Okura, 43
 Outlook, 30
 Pacific Coast, 45
 Pall Mall Gazette, 29
 Parmanand, Bhai, 21
 Peasants, 29
 Port Simpson, 45
 Portuguese, 42
 Punjab, 24, 35-36, 39
 Pyare Krishan, 21
 Ravi, 21
 Roberts, Charles, 30, 39-40, 47
 Russia, 55
 Russo Japanese War, 43
 Sahai, Krishna, 23
 Samartha, N.M., 24
 Scott, MacCallum, 60
 Shaw, Bernard, 48
 Sikhs, 39
 Sorbonne, 61
 South Africa, 41, 42, 44-46
 Swetenham, Sir Frank, 52
 Switzerland, 49
 Sydenham, Lord, 33
 Times, 25, 27, 31, 39, 51-52, 60-61
 Tokyo, 72-73
 Tory Party, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33-34, 49
 Turkey, 49, 54, 57
 Vichy, 35
 Victoria (B.C.) Times, 41
 Victoria, Queen, 41
 Wales, 44
 Webbs, 48-49, 54, 63
 Wedderburn, Sir William, 35-36, 51, 59
 Wedderburn, Lady, 36
 Westminster, 27, 59
 Whig, 27

